

625.c.26
3
ADDITIONS
AND
EMENDATIONS
TO THE

GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARIES

With a REPLY to

Mr. WILLIAM SYMES, Master
of St. Saviour's School in Southwark.

By RICHARD JOHNSON, M. A.
Master of the Free-School
in Nottingham.

*Demetri req; Tigelli
Discipulorum inter Jubeo plorare Cathedras. Hor.*

NOTTINGHAM :

Printed by W. Ayscough, for William Ward,
Bookseller, There.

ADDITIONS

AND

EMENDATIONS

TO THE

GENERAL COMMENTARIES

WRITTEN BY

MR. WILLIAM STILES, Master
of the Free-School in Cambridge.

BY RICHARD JOHNSON, M.A.
Master of the Free-School
in Birmingham.

Printed and Sold by T. B. & C.
at the New-Printed Office, in Pall-mall.

NOTTINGHAM:

Printed by W. Atkinson, for William Ward,
Book-Binder, Thos.

()
THE

PREFACE.

R *Eader*, Since the *Commentaries* have appear'd, they have had several Adversaries; if they had been such as had been able, either singly, or together, to have corrected my Mistakes, supply'd my Oversights, and finish'd what I had begun, and so far advanc'd; it wou'd have been some Consolation; that what Reputation soever I might have lost, I might yet have sav'd the Time it has cost me to do it my Self. But instead of that, it has been my ill Luck to have to do with such an awkward set of Mortals, as will needs be Writing without Reading, when yet the main of the Controversy depends upon Reading. Such as only serve to divert a Man from his Business by impertinent Cavils, not to do him any considerable Service in setting Things right. About half a score Errours they have found amongst them, but have made more each of them in the Dispute. One Triumphs because he has found *A'gus* and *Algum*, which I had overlook'd, and in the same Book makes above a Hundred gross Mistakes in his *Select Observations*, beside a many frigid and jejune Notes upon the Use of the Conjunctions, which are common to all Languages, and no Body can be ignorant of, as shall be shewn, when I can get a little Time.

What my pert Adversary Mr *Symes* objects against (and that out of meer good Nature, you must know, to *Help a Brother*) that cannot easily be defended, is upon the words *Tiara*, and *Spinther*. For, as for *Semis*, he knows not what to make of it himself. To these three I have spoken in the *Additions*, and *Emendations*. And as to the rest *Chaos*, *Epos*, *Melos*, he confesses 'tis most probable they are Non-crescents, and where then shou'd they be plac'd, but where 'tis most probable they belong to? Beside that *Chaos* is plainly a Non-crescent in Latin. And though the other, as well as *Chaos*, have encrease in Greek, so have *Cetus*, *Erebus*, both declin'd in Latin without encrease. *Eos* appears to Children as ending in *os*, and is of next Affinity to it; and since we know of no Declension it has in Latin, it may as well be where it is, as elsewhere.

The Preface,

In *Spinther* the Gender is rightly deliver'd, but the Accent not heeded. Does he not remember, that Mr Leeds (of whom he says so Pathetically, 'twas pity he liv'd not to do more) made three such Mistakes upon the Heels of one another upon the Second Special Rule? Let him look at Home, and see whether greater Mistakes than these are not to be found there. In the beginning of his Preface he says, This must be said in Commendation of the common Grammar, that it prescribes no Plautisms; we find not so much as Quotations, out of Ennius, Cinna Columella, and the like. No, it founds its Rules upon the Authority of the purest Writers. Of the purest Writers! Why, what are Plautus, and Columella? Take Cicero's Character of the First in the Words of Crassus, *Neq; solum rusticam asperitatem, sed etiam peregrinam insolentiam fugere discamus. Equidem cum audio socrum meam Laliā (facilius enim mulieres incorruptam antiquitatem Conservant, quod multorum sermonis expertes, ea tenent semper, qua prima didicerunt) sed eam sic audio, ut Plautum mihi, aut Nævium edicere audire. de Or: L. 3. p. 21.* Take that of *Ælius S. Iolo* in Varro. *Musus Plautino sermone locutus fuisse si Latine loqui vellent. Quint: Inst: 13. 1.* Take that of *Agellius*. *Neq; so necisum esse aiebat; in potestatem fuisse, ut vulgus semidoctrum putat, sed ratione dictum certā, et probā contendebat, quā et Græci ita uterentur: Et Plautus Verborum Latinorum Elegantissimus in Amphitryone dixit, numero mihi in mentem fuit, non, ut dici solitum est in mente. L. 1. C. 7. Plautus lingue atq; Elegantiæ in Verbis Latine Princeps. Id: L. 7. C. 17.* Now what shall a poor Man do, that would willingly follow his Leaders, when the Leaders themselves go several Ways? These three, and the School-Master of St. Saviours.

But are there no Plautisms in the common Grammar? I find fifteen, with his Name to fourteen of them, and those, some to prescribe unusual Constructions. As for Columella, who ever rejected his Authority? Whoever quored him without Respect? *Vossius* calls him *purissimum scriptorem* in one Place, and in another says *Meretricationem non multum averfer, quando Meretricari ipsius Columellæ est.* But is there not so much as one Quotation out of Columella in the common Grammar? Why no, so it seems, we have a Gentlemen's Word for it, that Teaches it every Day. But then there is one that has not Taught it this twenty Years, that fancies he has found four Quotations out of this same Abdicated Columella. *Fons latus pedibus tribus, altus triginta. In morem hosti areas latus pedum decem longas quinquaginum facito. Agricola contrarium est pastoris propositum. And Done: ea aqua quam adjeceris decocta sit.* I have heard of a grave Assembly,

The Preface,

Assembly, not that of Divines, that voted Eight, or Nine to be more than twenty, but this is the first time I ever heard that there was not one in four. My Brother would make a rare Disputant, if Facing would do. He and the rest of them confess that I have discover'd things new and useful, and better'd the state of Grammatical Learning: and yet all fall upon me with intemperate Language, as if I had done something so Heinous, as to extinguish the Merit of a confessed Service. Two of them pretend that I have us'd *Vossius* ill; I know not in what, unless in discovering his mistakes, and I know not that I have ever been Address'd to Cultivate such an Understanding with the *Dutch*, as to forbear that. In other things I speak as respectfully of him, as any Body, and in these no where Reproach, but excuse him. And this both my Adversaries do themselves, contradict him as often as they can. Now I am a Subject of Great-Britain, Reader, where's my Liberty and Property then? Mr Symes, with whom I have now to do, owns I have a hard task on't, and am to march through Authors heavier, and ruggeded than a Soldiers Roads, to undergo more Pains, Fatigues, and Hardships, than are usually in so many yearly Campaigns. That I Labour under this particular Disadvantage, that as coming after others Learned and Inquisitive, I must Glean, Rake up, and gather their Leavings; a Task equally difficult and unpleasant. And yet it must be said in due Commendation of Mr Johnson, that he has oblig'd the World with Discoveries new and useful in their kind. That a compleat Grammarian deserves to be Esteem'd and Honoured; nay, so far as he Benefits the Nation, Publickly Thank'd, and Rewarded. Now I can say, with *Dido*,

Non ego cum Danis Trojanam excindere gentem

Aulide juravi, Classemve ad Pergama misi:

Nec patris Anchisa cineres, manesve revelli.

Neither against my Country, nor against the Family of the Symes's have I done any Thing. What is't that sets this Snarler a Barking then? Why, *mala mens, malus animus*. That's all I know of the matter. But I defame Lilly's Grammar; and *Nolumus Lillium defamari*. Let him vindicate him then: 'Tis more than he has done yet. But I have Faults as well as Lilly: Well, so I have, but not so many, though a great many more than Mr. Symes ever dreamt of. What a Triumph shou'd we have had, if my Adversaries had found but one half of the Faults in the Commentaries? There was no good Will wanting, that's plain. Have I made so many as I have mended? There is no such pretence, that I hear of. Are all Faults that are pretended? Not that neither. Has ever any Body wrote upon this Subject without Faults? no: Or with few-

er?

The Preface,

er? no : What's the meaning of all this noise then ?
Why no Thoughts of the good old Rule ?

Si quid novisti rectius istis

Candidus imperti, si non his utere mecum.

Sure these People think, that, because I am an Old Man, I have lost all my Teeth.

But I am accus'd also of Writing bad Latin my self, Well, what is it, think you ? Why I say in the Title to my Dedication *Ludorum in Angliâ magistris*. Now this shou'd have been *Ludi-magistris* forsooth ? Why so ? Why because these two Words are never us'd together, but in Composition. And now what shall we do Reader ? Why e'en show these People what they are.

Ei lude, si ullus est, magistram hanc esse satis certo scio Ter: Hec: 2, 1.

Magister ludi factus de Tyranno. Val: Max: 6, 9.

Quem tibi magister ludi nescio quis, ex alienis orationibus compositum dedit. Cic: in Q. Cæcil.

The next is, That I say, *Eandem voliscum nactus provinciam*, and that shou'd have been *eandem, quam vos*. And all this because *Vossius* has a Rule that *cum* must never be us'd with *Idem*, but *Idem ac*, *Idem atque* ; Mr *Leeds*, whose immature Decease my Brother *Symes*, in this respect, so much Laments, liv'd long enough however to make this Objection. In a private Letter he sent me, printed by some body since his Death (I know not by whom, it may be my Brother *Symes* may) he says *He believes he was the oldest School-Master in England of his time, and he had never seen any such Construction*. Well, I hope I am not ty'd up to believe Mr *Leeds*'s Eyes, or those of my Brother *Symes* before my own. Now I have seen such Constructions more than once, in *eodem lecto tecum una* (*Subaud: Cubui.*) *Plaut: Amph: 2.2. Hunc eodem mecum patre genitum, cum mihi per aetatem summo nomine concessisset, in possessionem Armenia deduxi, qui tertius potentie gradus habetur. Tac: An: 15. p. 382. Qui clarâ voce juravit, si de collegâ suo gravius esset judicatum, in facis parius se eandem cum illo penam exilii subituram Val: Max: 6, 5. Item Mauri equites, qui in eodem cornu cum Elephantis erant, presidio deserti, principes fugiunt: Bell: Afr: p. 537. Cum a me quoque id responsum tulisses, me nullo modo posse iisdem parietibus tuto esse tecum. Cic: in Cat: 1. p. 91.*

And now 'tis plain, that the Pretence of Boys coming to know those Things of themselves by their Reading, which the Grammar is either false, or defective in. I say 'tis plain, this is mere Sham. These Masters we see have not come to them, *Vossius* has not come to them. And till there is a Compleat Grammar very few will ever come

The Preface.

come to them. 'Tis a great Part of the Business of a Man's whole Life, as the Case stands now with us. I believe it would be no hard matter to compile a Book, as big as this, which shou'd have false Latin, according to general Estimation, in every Sentence, and yet be warrantable by the best Authoritys. I am sure some of the greatest Writers have condemn'd that, which is as good, as what they approve. Let this for the present be the Experiment. Dr. Ker, or his Partner, takes a Rule from *Vossius* about the Construction of *Neq;* and *Aut* in these Words. *Aut barbarè subjicias si Neq; Præcesserit.* Objectant *Cic: 5. Fam: 11. Ei velim scribas; ut nullam rem neq; tam magnam, aut tam parvam putet, &c.* Sed in *Optt: Edd: est, neq; tam parvam.* *Vossi.* Now *Justin, Horace, Virgil, and Casar* are all Barbarians by this Rule.

Nam neq; illius interest quemadmodum, aut ubi cadam, Just. L. 14. p. 159. Donec à Cassandio missi sunt qui eum confoderent non refugientem gladium, nec vulnera, aut multisviter vociferantem. Id: 15. p. 162. *Neq; jam stabulis gaudet pecus aut arator igni.* *Hor. L. 1. Od: 4. Nec viget quicquam simile, aut secundum.* Id: 1b: *Od: 12. Again, L. 2. Od: 9.* He rings the changes with *Nec*, and *Aut* too long to be put here.

Nec leves somnos timor, aut cupido sordidus aufert. Id: *L. 2. Od: 16.*

Nec saevus Arcturi cadentis Impetus, aut orientis hordi, 3. *Od: 1*

Hunc nec diva venena, nec hosticus auferet ensis

Nec laterum dolor, aut tussis, nec tarda podagra. L. 1. *Sat: 9.*

Nec pueros coram populo Medea trucidet,

Aut humana palam coquat exta nefarius Atræus, Id: *Art:*

Neq; oves boediq; petulci

Floribus insultent, aut errans bucula campo

Decutiat rorem, *Virg: G. 4. V. 12.*

Nec sera comantem

Narcissum, aut flexi tacuissim Vimen Acanthi, Id: 1b: and thrice more. *Neq; aut quanta nationes incolerent; neq; quem usum belli haberent, aut quibus institutis uterentur, neq; qui essent ad majorum navium altitudinem idonei portus, reperire poterat Cæsar.* B. G. 4. p. 102. *Neq; sui colligendi, neq; consistendi, aut ex effedis desiliendi facultatem dederunt:* Id: B. G. L. 5. p. 132.

Thus Grammar, which should be compos'd out of the Latin Writers, and so fram'd wou'd be a means to understand them, and write like them, is nothing, but a System of Precepts rak'd from modern Criticks and Grammarians, unserviceable to either purpose; nay, a downright Obstruction to both. If this be not the Case, let these
Gentle-

The Preface,

Gentlemen answer me, out of any, or all their Grammars, or their own reading either, whether these Sentences be Latin, or not.

*Tam cum vitio est aversari bonos, quam fovere malos.
Ingenium acrius, neq; diligentiam majorem multi habent.
Cicis qui rempub. prodat, nequicquam ab hoste interest.
Sunt qui putent fortunam esse deam à qua omnia regantur.
Animalium alia pulchra, alia deformia, alia neutrum.
Dum exercitus in transportatione fluminis moraretur.
Et jam turris Primanos inciderat, obrueratq;
Fundum emit ad tria talenta, sed ad multo majorem summam vendidit.
Putat Seneca animum in corpore esse, tanquam alienæ domui.
Dixit, et è vestigio temporis ad regem impetum fecit.
Vulgus facile in partes traxit, tum omnia ingentia de se pollicendo, tum omnibus in locis Senatûs criminibus crescere.
Huic fabula non multum abhorrent ea, qua scripsit Athenagoras.
Homo est animal ratione mortale.
Venit tempus ijs qui timore fuerunt, ulciscendi sese.
Nonnulli nihil aliud quam Spectatâ Academiâ rus redeunt.
Respondebat se millies moriturum quam turpia faceret.
Turi plerumq; principes essent, si ijs artibus regnarent, quibus apiscuntur imperiorum.
Hæc civitas longè libertatis cæteris civitatibus antecellit.
Dixit, et statim eum cum gladio confodit.
Prætor impetrabat pro nobis ludendi veniam.
Vix dimidium, quam quod acceperat reddidit.
Obsecro nè super tali scelere suspectum me habeas.
Senatum in plebe mitigavit, in eoq; se valde amat, atq; ego quidem in eo illi gratias ago.
Fratres amicos multum amo; sed in majore benevolentia impari.
Quod negligenter scriptum est, etsi ad præsens placeat, non potest esse in delectatione diuturna.
Ut Hyems in odio est, ita æstas in dulcedine.
Non insciè dictum videtur in homine, homo homini lupus.
Nihilq; ago in toto, nisi ut tuis commodis inserviam.
Num id irascere, quod ardet in puellâ formosâ filius?
Plura dicerem nisi te in oratione mea offendi verear.
Ne tu mihi alios ostendas, quos non quamvis, ego in Pamphilo solus moror.
Gallorum rex in exemplo est, nè quis suis viribus nimium confidat.
Vita salusq; populi Romani in hac animâ pendebat.
Fortis, etsi non in spem victoria, tamen in ultione mortis pugnabit.
Cæteros in homicidio convictos securi percussit.
Sed in incidia rem esse futuram sentiens omisit.*

The Preface,

Quid mirum si Juvenis est in amore puella?

Multa dicit, et, ad speciem magnifica, sed si consideres, in nullo pondere verba loquitur.

Consul Romanus in hasta incedit.

Orator à multis superatus, tamen in nomine est.

In remedio est sanguinem equinum recentem bibere.

Libros primo quoq; tempore ad me missum facias.

Quare vos omnis exortum volumus, nequid in supplices vestros gravius statuatis,

Ille vero libens Magistratu abiit, dicendo se non tanti Senatui esse debere, ut in parcendo sibi malum publicum fiat.

Ista quidem facis, neq; te decora, neq; tuis parentibus,

Non est Idoneum auctoritate Magistratus, inepta vel facere, vel dicere.

Quin tu propone ad quod audias :

If a sudden Answer be return'd to these Quere's, (and when that's done. I can put them a thousand more) we shall soon see how the Land lies, namely, whether these Gentlemen have so far supply'd to themselves whats wanting in the common Grammar, and are Capable of judging what's Latin, and what not. But if the Answer be deferr'd, 'tis a plain Case, they as yet know nothing of the Matter ; they are Thumbing their Dictionaries, and their Indexes, and they, I can assure them, will not much help them. And yet it is said these Indexes have been a great Help to the Commentaries. First, What if they have ? The Book is never the worse for that. Secondly, *Faciunt na intelligendo ut nihil intelligant.* This is urg'd to undervalue my Pains, and it makes them more. 'Tis plain I quote from other Editions, and that for the most Part to the very Page : So that at this Rate I must first have found the Word in the Delphin Editions, and then look'd what Page it was found in the other. Let them spend one morning at this Work, and I'll warrant them their Bellies full. Thirdly, He that knows not that the Indexes are imperfect, and not to be depended on, knows nothing at all of this matter. Lastly, Whatever Service they are of, they are open to them, as well as to me. Let them go to them therefore for a Solution of the former Quere's, and try their Luck. But enough of this.

I have only now to acquaint thee, Reader, that, ever since the Publication of the Commentaries, I have been upon a Research, to see what I could find of Mistakes, or

Omissi

The Preface,

Omissions, fit to be added to the Book. And in *Pliny*, *Celsus*, and the *Rustick Writers* I have had the Assistance of my Learned, and Candid Friend Dr. *Shaw*, Master of *Tamworth* School, so that I hope, betwixt us both, there's nothing in them left unobserv'd, though several of his Letters being unhappily lost, I could not have the Benefit of them. But I have endeavour'd to make up this Misfortune by my own Diligence. The Reverend Mr. *William Turney*, the Learned Master of *Stamford* School has likewise transmitted to me some useful Observations, and for the Ablatives absolute, as they are call'd in i, I am entirely beholden to him. As for the rest of the Authors, I have gone through them with all the Care, and Circumspection I am capable of. And if my Judgment had been equal to my Pains, I could have put the Book into thy Hands, as it now stands with greater Assurance. But where that fails, I must beg thee to supply it with thy own. Thou wilt not want materials here to form it by. If this meet with a Candid Acceptance, it will be some Encouragement to me (though not sufficient of it self, for the Charge and Pains I must be at) to prepare my Latin Syntax for the Press: Which having been my main View ever since I began this Work, I have spared for no Pains to make it perfect, or as near it as may be. This I can averr, if my Word will go for any thing, that the Grammarians have all been much more loose, and defective in this, than the other Part.

ADDITIONS and EMENDATIONS TO THE GRAMMATICAL COMMENTARIES, &c.

After *Animadversion* 1st. My Brother *Symes* is against me here, for the old Definition *Tooth and Nail*. What he advances of his own is (beside one senseless, and Ungrammatical Interpretation of *Terence*, and another not much better) that *Ornatè* stands in the Definition of *Rhetorick* unquarrel'd with, and that I have unawares put *Orthography* into mine, which flyly carries the abdicated Word *rectè* in the Belly of it. To this I answer, that *Ornatè* and *Orthographia* have one, and only one stated Signification, when apply'd to Speech. Let him shew the same of *rectè*, and the Dispute is over. Till then he has made a Parallel of one Line. As for what he borrows from Mr. *Leeds*, it has been answer'd to Mr. *Leeds*; at least, I presume, I may say so, till 'tis reply'd to. However, not to trouble the Reader with References, for his sake we'll go't over again. They both say, that *Rectè loqui*, signifies always to speak as one ought, and what that is in particular, the Context will make out. In the first Place, I have prov'd against Mr. *Leeds*, that *Rectè loqui* does not always signifie to speak as one Ought, by that Passage of *Plautus Pseud.* sc: *Viso quid rerum*, &c. Where *Simo* asking *Ballio* what *Pseudolus* had said, when he came to understand, that he had sold the young Wench to the Soldier, after he had promised to stay till *Callidorus*, cou'd raise Money to buy her, he says.

Sim. Quid ait? quid narrat? quæso quid dicit tibi?

Bal. Nugas Theatri, Verba qua in Comædijs

Solent lenoni dici, qua pueri sciunt,

Malum, et scelestum, perjurum aiebat esse me,

Sim. Pol haud mentitu 'st Bal. Ego haud iratus fui,

A

Nam

*Nam quanti refert te nec Rectè dicere
Qui nibili faciat, quiq; inficias non eat?*

By which Place, and what pass'd betwixt them, Act. 1. Sc. 3. I say 'tis Plain, that *Ballio* means not by *nec rectè dicere*, that *Callidorus*, and *Iseudorus* had abus'd him, and not spoken of him, well, rightly, and as they ought, but that they had call'd him all to naught, as we say, which he confels'd to be true enough, but said, he car'd not for it.

In the next Place, if *Rectè loqui* did always signifie as we ought to speak, I say, that Term is too general, Comprizes too much for the Subject of Grammar. For there are a great many Things, which we ought to have regard to in speaking, which Grammar does not so much as treat of. The first is (what wou'd have sav'd all this Controversy, if my Brother wou'd have observ'd it) that we speak of Nothing, but what we understand. Next that our Discourse be adapted to the Nature of the Thing, the Capacity, Temper, and Condition of the Hearers, and of our selves likewise. That it be clear and strong in the Reasoning Part, moving in the Perswasive, of a just mean between too much and too little, orderly in its Disposition, and in its Elocution distinct, decent, and harmonious. And what does Grammar Teach of all this? Why, just Nothing. Rhetorick and Prudence do the whole Business.

But they say, it will be known by the Place where it stands. This may do something, say I, where there is a Context to refer to; but what will it help in a Definition? For Example, *Grammatica est. rectè loquendi ars.* *Grammatica* is a Thing unknown, or else why defin'd? *Ars* is a general, and determines Nothing in Particular. There remains *Rectè Loquendi* for the Particular, an ambiguous Term, to be explain'd by what? Why, either *Ars* a General, or *Grammatica* unknown. O! the Power of Logick in the Hands of an Artist. In his Discourse about Gender, Pa. 41, he discharges *Sexus* from the Definition of Gender, because of its being an equivocal, ambiguous and perplex Term, and here contends for *Rectè loqui*, just such another, and all by the Virtue of Logick still.

Again, P. 46. And, indeed this I must say of it, Viz. Vossius's Definition of Gender, cou'd the double meaning of *Sexus* be allow'd, I should not scruple to pronounce it, as far as my Judgment goes, far the best yet Extant. But there is a Rule in Logick never yet Repeated, expressly forbidding such Indulgence. *Definitio Verbis propriis, perspicuis, usitatis, et ab omni ambiguitate liberis exprimitur.*

Quo teneam Vultus mutantem Protea nodo ?

But this is the perpetual Fate of conceited, moody sower Scriblers, to cut themselves every step they go, saying one Thing in one Place, another in another, as the Spirit of Opposition leads them; as will be apparent under the next head.

We have seen what Grammar is not, let us now see what it is.

I say, 'Tis the Art of expressing the Relations of Things according to the Custom of those whose Language we learn. What says Brother Symes? Why, no by no means in this Place, but Page 18. 19. speaking of the general Nature and End of Words in Language, which is the Subject of Grammar, he says, *To this End it is necessary, that Words should be adequate to Thoughts, that as Thoughts are simple, in Regard to Things simply apprehended; and Complex, as the Relation of Things to each other is compared and argued in the Understanding: So Words should be first absolute in their Signification, answering to every Simple Thought, then connected to each other in such a Manner, as to represent Thoughts complex. This Construction being Nothing else, but the mutual Relation of Words, arises from the Connexion of Thoughts, considering the Relation of Things one to another. And now by this means, that is to say, by Signification, and other appointed Powers adapted to Construction, Words become capable of communicating in Speech all sorts of Thoughts. And is it not a thousand Pity's we two shou'd fall out now, Reader. My Brother says, the whole of Language is to represent simple, and complex Thoughts. I suppose he will hardly say, Grammar has any thing to do with the first, and I define it by the latter. Now, where is the Difference? Why, my Brother is not always of a mind. Sometimes he is delivering his own Schemes, and there common Sense creeps upon him now and then, before he's aware: Sometimes again, he has me to oppose, and there the Spirit of Contradiction Works, makes him gain-say not only me, but himself too.*

I come to his Interpretations of Terence. The first is in *Heautontimorumenos* Act 2. Sc. 1. *Tum quod dem ei rectè est.* Upon which Farnaby, of better Authority than Minellius, if it must go by Authority, has this Note, *Tum quod dem ei Obsequium tantum voces, et blanditia, ejusmodi sunt, Rectè, benignè. Nam nihil esse mihi nefas dicere, non licet, non a-sum dicere.* Answerable to this I had render'd the Sense in the Commentaries. If she ask me for any thing, I can only put her off with saying *Rectè*, well, well, which is in Effect, I have Nothing for her; but to say in plain Terms, I have

Nothing for her, I dare not for my Life. Let us see the whole Passage.

Clit. Magis nunc me amica dicta stimulant : Da mihi, atq; affer mihi. Cui quid respondeam, nil habeo : neq; me quisquam est miserior. Nam Clinia hic, etsi is quoq; suarum rerum satagit, attamen, Habet benè et pudicè eductam, ignaram artis Meretricia. Mea est potens, procax, magnifica, sumptuosa, nobilis. Tum quod dem ei rectè est : Nam nihil esse mihi Religio est dicere.

What says Brother Symes now? Why *Tum quod dem ei Rectè est*. When I can give, 'tis as it ought to be. How? *Tum quod dem ei. when I can give*. Where's the Grammar on't? At this Rate, we must interpret above, *cui quid respondeam, nil habeo*. Whom when I can answer, I have nothing. But I hope my Brother out of his great Reading will help us to a Parallel first. Then for *rectè est*. It is as it ought to be, where's the Sense here? It is as it ought to be, What is as it ought to be? Why the Amour, I suppose. That goes on well, the Mistress is kind, I have nothing to say against the Sense of this Proposition taken by it self, if the rest of the Words wou'd bear it. But how shall we tack it to what follows? *Nam nihil esse mihi religio est dicere*. Here's a plain Causal, and the former Part must of Necessity be the Effect of it. *Tum quod dem ei rectè est*, That is, according to my Brother. Therefore she is kind, when I can give, because I have nothing to give, and dare not say so. To insist further upon this, were to suppose the Reader another Symes, which I think there is no fear of.

His next is in *Adelphis*, *Et rectè, et verum dicis*, and here he charges me with the Interpretation of *Minellius*, viz. *Rectè ad Verba, verum ad rem*, and infers, *sure Verba have a Relation to Grammar, Well, so let them have*: But is that Relation consider'd here? is *Rectè dicis* as much as *Grammaticè dicis*? If not, what's all this to the Purpose. The Place will soon satisfy the Reader, Act 4. Sc.3.

For a Conclusion, to exercise my Brother's interpreting Faculty, Let him prove in these Instances that *Rectè* always signifies *Rightly*, and as it ought be. *Quare Epicurus circuitione quadam deos tollens, rectè non dubitat divinationem tollere*. Cic. Div. 2. P. 227. *Vitem bene enodatam deligato rectè, flexuosa uti ne fiet*. and soon after, *Alligatoq; rectè dum ne minimum constringas*. Cat. R. R. C. 33. *Nec Magna est putationis differentia cubantis, et stantis rectè vi-*

nea, Col. L. 5. C. 15. Nam si omnes atomi declinabunt, nulla unquam cohaerescunt: vel si alia declinabunt, alia suo mutuo rectè ferentur, primum erit hoc quasi provincias atomis dare, qua rectè, qua oblique ferentur, Cic. Fin. L. 1. P. 103. Ejus pampinos teneros alligato leviter, porrigitoq; uti rectè spectent. Cat. R. R. C. 33. Tum rectè currentes humanà Effigie, propter velocitatem nisi senes, aut agri non capiuntur. Plin, N. H. L. 7. C. 2.

After *Animadversion 2.* My Brother takes me up again here for saying the Substantive, and Adjective are distinct Parts of Speech, and the Participle agrees exactly with the Adjective, as being out of Order. And says, In short, it is too soon, and too arbitrarily said, before some Account given of the Parts of Speech, and of their Distinguishing Characters. Now Reader, this *Animadversion* is but Nine Lines, and the very next is to prove the Substantive distinct from the Adjective. And is it not the Way of all Writers in such Sorts of Discourse to averr a Thing in one Place, and to refer to another, much more distant, for the Proof of it, even to other Volumes of the Book, nay to some part of the Work not yet Publish'd?

After *Animadversion 3.* His next Fling is at my Definition of a Substantive. And a great many quere Concepts he has upon it. He asks what so subsists in the Understanding? Now I answer, Thing. But then says Brother, Do not things subsist with their Beings? Or are Men Houses and Mountains in the Understanding? Before I answer, I have one question to ask, Namely how Things subsist with their Beings, I am afraid this is a darker Expression, than any Brother Symes complains of. Now for answer, I do not remember that ever I had a Mountain really in my Understanding (what Brother Symes's Swinger may hold, I cannot tell) but for all that, Things are commonly said to be in the Mind, when they are thought of, both in English, the Language I define by, as every Body knows, and in Latin too. *Comprehendere, Concipere, Figere, Affigere, Infigere, Subire, Venire*, with *Mente*, or *Animo*, or some other Case are Instances of it. And none but a gloomy Trifler wou'd have made this Objection, with his Houses and Mountains. which in Effect shew only that once more *Parturiunt montes nascetur ridiculus Mus*. Beside, I explain my self to mean no more by subsisting in the Understanding, than being the Subjects of our Thoughts, and by Consequence, if we please, the Subjects of Predication. But this pleases him less than tother. For he says, there are Substantives, that can't be Subjects of Predication, and that I confess it. Well, this

is all very true, but nothing to the Purpose. Had I defin'd a Substantive to be the Subject of Predication, my Brother had nick'd me; But as Luck is, I define it to be the Name of a Thing (which Thing I now declare, and 'twas plain enough before) may so subsist in the Understanding, as to be the Subject of Predication. And now to come to his Instances, which he thinks must needs gravel me so, *Nocte*, and *Noctu*, I hope they both signify Night, as well as by Night, and sure Night may be the Subject of Predication. I see Nothing Dark in the whole matter, but that *Nocte*, *Noctu*, &c. happen to be the Instances, and Night is not always dark neither. But this Objection was answer'd before 'twas started, as the Reader will perceive upon the Place, though Brother Symes says no, and therefore I shall say no more of it.

But he accuses me too for Desiring here without a Genus, viz. *A Substantive is the Name of a Thing*, &c. well, now I see what Understandings there are in the World, I shall for the Future be more careful what I leave to the Understanding. But before I saw Brother Symes's Book, I thought every Body would have seen, we had been talking of Words or Parts of Speech, and would from thence have supply'd the Genus. But I beg Brother's Pardon, I see my Errour, I did not consider his Understanding. But he says, the Name of Thing is purely shuffled in here, and that it was never mention'd in the Structure and Parts of the Definition. Why this is the very Definition, *A Grammatical Substantive is the Name of a thing, that may subsist by it self in the Understanding, so as to be the Subject of Predication*. If he takes that in the Beginning of my 3d. Animadversion, viz. *as Substance in the Categories is that which subsists in Nature by it self; so Substantive in the Parts of Speech signifies that, which subsists of it self in the Understanding*, I say; if he takes this for the Definition, he can't complain for want of a Genus. Substantive in the Parts of Speech, plainly intimates Part of Speech to be the Genus. But if all this won't do, he has me upon the Hip in another Respect, and that is, that I am too much pleas'd with my Definition, and boast of it in a quack Air and Language, viz. *This is the true Definition of a Substantive. To the Tune of the true Daffodil Elixir. The true Spirit of Scurvy-grass*. Well, 'tis a mighty Advantage to have ones Study in a London Coffee-house, where a Man may read the News, smoke his Pipe, drink a Dish of Coffee, and have these bright and witty Images convey'd to his Thoughts, and all for a

Penny. Now Reader, *Felix quæ faciunt*, Thou seest my Misfortune, have a Care thou dost not fall into the like. Never talk of a true Notion or Definition, however thou mayst be tempted: but learn of my Brother to express thy self modestly, without any appearance of a quack Air and Language. Thou wilt have great plenty of Examples in the Book, but till that can be got, which must needs now be very scarce, from the Reception it has met with, I will collect thee some few for thy present Use. Preface P. 10. For my Part I wish well to the Commentaries; as a sign I do, by taking this Pains to correct them. P. 19. Among these last I have respect to Mr. Johnson, whom I wish good Success; My Remarks are at his Service. If they have done his Commentaries a Kindness, I may expect to find him gratum, et lubenter agnoscentem according to promise. L. P. 11. And yet Mr. Johnson went a great Way out of his Province to fetch it, when at the same time the true Derivation lay before his Nose, which, I hope he will see, when I point to it. You will be apt to say here is the Word True though. Well, but you must consider, that he is talking here of me, that can't see a Thing before my Nose, till he points to it, which takes off a great deal of the Immodesty of the Word True. Beside True Derivation is one thing, and True Definition another. P. 13. With Submission therefore to Voilius, I shall adhere to my Opinion, (You must not suppose, because it is True, for that it is not) till I am better convinced. P. 23. thus quietly, says He, thus easily are grand Debates brought to an Issue, when matters are fairly stated, and set in a True Light. Here's the Word True again, but then you must observe how it is abated by the Modesty of the Introduction. Ibid, ' Poor Mr. Johnson! What Pains does he take to maintain a Notion, which if it were true, ' wou'd defend itself. Where beside the Modesty of the Expression, you may observe there's no need of maintaining any, but false Notions, true Ones will defend themselves.

We have seen my Definition of a Substantive, viz. that it is the Name of a thing, which thing so subsists in the Understanding, as that it may be the Subject of Predication, that is, may be consider'd by it self and Predicated of. Under which Notion all the Substantives in the World will naturally fall, and that in all Languages, which makes this Grammatical Doctrine Universal, the Thing that Brother Symes so much wishes for, and laments the want of it, though (however it came to escape his great Reading) it is done long since. Now let us see that of Brother Symes, which has these two small Faults, that

that it is neither *True*, nor consistent: Beside a third disadvantage, that it is not fitted for all Languages.

His Notion, or rather Notions, are P. 11. *Nomen Substantivum* I take to be derived from *Substantia*, which it signifies, as *Verbum Activum*, *Passivum*, *Inceptivum*, &c. are so call'd from their Signification of *Actio*, *Passio*, &c.

Substantia to be derived from *Substare* he says, is rational: But not in the Whym of standing under the Predicate; but because *substāt accidentibus* which is an Essential Part of its Definition omitted by Mr. Johnson. Indeed the whole had better been omitted, as not belonging to us.

From hence, & P 8th, where he says, *What does the Substantive in the Parts signifie, but the very same substance or thing which Subsists in Nature by it self?* From these two Places, I say, we may gather that his Definition of a Substantive is this. *A Substantive is the Name of a Thing which subsists in Nature, by it self, and is the subject of Accidents.* Now out of a great many Questions, that might be ask'd upon this Head, I desire the Solution of one only at Present, and that is, what Part of Speech *Veritas* is by this Definition. For, not to beg a Favour of a Logician without a Reason, I would fain know where it *subsists in Nature by it self*. I would go a good Way to ask a Question or two about Brother Symes, and his Notions, which seem I had almost said, as odd and Provoking to me, as mine to him about a Pronoun. But pluck up a good Heart Reader, though the Man be a little positive, yet he is not inflexible; he'll give you another Notion presently, and that quite contrary, P. 17. *When a Substantive signifying Things real or accidents (which are all a Substantive can signifie) may by the Turn, &c.* Why law ye there now! Who says Brother Symes is not a civil Gentleman? If one Notion won't please ye, ye may take the contrary. But if all this will not do, here's greater Variety still. I think it will be most for thy Service, Reader, to put the Notions of this kind down in two Columns, not for Fear they should not stand quietly together, but that thou mayst the more readily find and Compare them, and see how apposite they are to one another.

A Substantive is the Name of a Thing which subsists in Nature by it self, and is the Subject of Accidents. P. 8. 11.

The Substantive standing by it self (so Vossius had defin'd it) is but an accidental Circum-

A Substantive signifying things real, or Accidents, which are all a Substantive can signifie. P. 17.

A Part of Speech is a kind of Words distinguish'd by the same Accidents necessary in
stance,

stance, as it stands related to Construction.

And it is not so reasonable to suppose, that a Part of Speech, shou'd take its Name from such a Circumstance, rather than its Signification, which says Vossius himself is *forma essentialis, et quasi animae vocis*, P. 19.

It has Accidents as a Word, as a Kind, the same. P. 21.

Among the rest, I suppose we must understand here the Accidents of *Pone quando, quidem si &c.* For they are all Parts of Speech. Again,

Signification is always a distinguishing Accident.

The absolute Signification of the Substantive must be accounted a peculiar Accident. P. 22.

Are their Accidents the same? i. e. of the Participle and the Adjective? No. It is peculiar to the Participle to signify Time, Action, Passion and Being. P. 23.

Reader you see you may make Signification an Accident, or no Accident, but *Forma essentialis, et quasi animae vocis*, and that's Liberty enough sure.

Homo est animal rationale.
If you define to a Man.

But if to a School-Boy.

A Man is a living thing, with a Hat on his Head, wearing Cloths different from a Woman. For that's all Children understand by Man. P. 16.

Now Reader, whatever respect you may have for Mr. Symes, and his Notions, and you can't well have more than I have, I would advise thee by all means to keep on thy Hat, especially if thou art a School-master. For I have observ'd some naughty Poys to be less obedient to my Commands, as not taking me for a Man, I suppose, because I usually go into the School without my Hat. Indeed Brother Symes, if thou shouldst talk at this Rate to some School-Boys, I doubt the Hat on thy Head wou'd hardly secure thee, they'd pluck thee by the Beard. *Vellent tibi Barham lasciivi Pueri.* If this be to any Thing, 'tis to that of Tom a Bodkin.

Animadversion 4 P. 8. Line the last, after by Propositions add, or Cases.

After *Animadversion* 4. This Doctrine went down with Brother Symes neither. However he confesses the Substantive and the Adjective to be two different Parts of Speech. Here is one Point gain'd then against Lilly, so far we are agreed then. Let us see what disgruntles him. Why I say, the Adjective is not as much the Name of a Thing as the Substantive. Well, I am so unfortunate I confess. What says Brother Symes? Why, *It Must be confess'd against Mr. Johnson, That the Adjective and Substantive do both signifie Thing, and both equally.* What, in pulcher Homo for instance, is Pulcher as much, or equally the Name of Man, as Homo? The Substantive represents all that is essential to the Nature of the Thing, as Homo or Man, represents Animal rationale. Now for my Brother's Answer. And Animal with the Adjective rationale represents all that is essential to Homo, or Man. Now an hundred pounds for an Ergo: A Substantive and Adjective, Animal rationale will represent all that is essential to Homo, or Man: will an Adjective alone do it, Rationalis for instance? Whats here concluded then against me? He goes on, *But how does Homo represent the Essentials of a Man, more than his accidentals, his two Legs?* I have heard of Mens Loosing Legs by accident, but I never heard of their getting them so. What is nothing but Soul essential to Man? I have heard of Men that have been all Heart, but never of any, beside Brother Symes, that has been all Soul. I would advise my Brother to make the Head an Accident too, 'twould be of more Service to him, than he is aware of, prove his Arguments to represent all that is essential to reasoning, though there be in them *nec Caput, nec Pedes*. But let us see how this Notion of my Brothers will fadge the other Way, namely, whether the Adjective be the Name of the Quality inherent, though not of the Subject. This my Brother seems to drive at, and unless he does, he contradicts not me. Bonus Good, say I, represents only an Accidental Quality. And Bonitas Goodness represents no more, says my Brother, Pulcher fair, and Pulchritudo Fainness represent Qualities alike in my Judgment. Represent them alike! Why, I'll be far enough then. The Adjective bonus in Conjunction with the Substantive intimates the Quality in the Subject, which Subject it denominates from thence. The Substantive bonitas is the Quality abstracted by the Imagination from the Subject. So that Quality is represented under both indeed, but not alike, I hope. In one it is the Name of the Quality, and may be the Subject of a Verb by it self: in the other it denominates its Subject, and cannot be the Subject of a Verb

Verb by it self, which it might doubtless, if 'twere equally the Name of a Thing. And if the Substantive alone represent all that is essential to the Nature of the Thing, as it certainly does to all such as understand the Nature of the Thing, and the Signification of the Name, which the Adjective does not, and can subsist by it's self in the Understanding, and be consider'd there, so as to become the Subject, which the Adjective cannot: it must be more the Name of the Thing, than the Adjective. Certainly there must at least be as much Difference betwixt them, as betwixt Verbs Active, and Passive, which yet my Brother Symes makes different Parts of Speech. And how odd soever this notion may seem to my Brother, I will venture to found the Definition of an Adjective upon it, namely, 'An Adjective is the Name of a Thing, which cannot so subsist by it self in the Understanding, as to be the Subject of Predication without a Substantive.

And now what difference is there between this, and my Brother's notion, when he says, *But the Signification of the Adjective being Relative, respecting always the Substantive (whose Signification is absolute) and being so appointed for Construction sake, it must be accounted a peculiar Accident*, P. 22. I see no difference here, but because I do not with Brother Symes call Signification an Accident. And if I must give my reason, 'twas because it Signification were an Accident, I knew not how to Account for the Essential Form. Beside that, if I had fallen in with my Brother here, I must have fallen out with him in another Place, P. 13. where, as has been observ'd before, he owns with *Vossius*, that Signification is, *Forma Essentialis, et quasi anima Vocis* Upon my saying, For *Adjectivum* from *Adjicio*, and there can be no need of adding any Thing to the Substantive, but what is accidental, what is Essential to the Substantive, being in it already; the Reply is, *We are not making or mending a Man*) Præterea Brother mend one if thou canst though) but in talking of him we may add an Epithet, or use an Adjective expressing his Essentials, or Accidentals. There can be no need, say I, we may says my Brother. He has told us he was at the University, and what he learn'd there, namely to expect two *termini essentielles* in a Definition. Well, a Gentleman's Word must be taken. But I think he has a good Action against his Tutor then, if he did not teach him to make his Assertion contradict his Adversary.

But I had almost forgot to do my Brother Justice, he has one Argument for an Adjective's being as much the

Name of a Thing, as the Substantive, because a Substantive may by the Turn of a Termination only, without the least altering the Sense become an Adjective, as in these Instances, *Statua ex auro*, or *aurea statua*. *Clamor hostium*, or *Clamor hostilis*. *Urbs Roma*, or *Urbs Romana*.

Now I remember an honest Gentleman in Cambridge, not a Scholar, but a well Willer, that wou'd needs have *duntaxat* to be a Verb, because of its Termination. My Brother Symes may have been acquainted with him for ought I know, and then he is no Original in this Sense. But in sober sadness, what has Termination to do in the Parts of Speech? 'Tis the Signification must decide the matter, when all's done and said, as my Brother says. *Amor* the Noun and *Amor* the Verb without the least Turn of Termination are two different Parts of Speech, I suppose in my Brother Symes's Judgment; and one the Name of a Thing, the other not. And as little as he knows of the Latin Tongue, he can hardly be so ignorant, as not to find a great many such Instances upon Recollection. And as for the Identity of Sense, which I have not yet taken notice of, that will not mend the matter. *Audito Casaris adventu*, and *audito Casarem adventisse* are all one in Sense, and the Turn of Terminations as little, as from *Clamor hostium* into *Clamor hostilis*. And yet my Brother cannot say by his Principles that *adventisse* and *adventu* are the same Parts of Speech; because he makes the Accidents to be Essential to the Definition, which are here different, if *adventisse* have any at all. And this is it that has led this great Logician into these Illogical notions, and Conclusions, namely, that in the Definition of the Parts of Speech, the Distinction of each must be by its Accidents. This he is so full of, that it makes the greatest Part of his Remarks upon this *Animadversion*, and is the great contradistinguishing Character between his notions and mine. For this End, he lays his Foundation as deep, as the Original of Words, says, they were Originally in themselves either meer dumb Letters, or inarticulate Sounds, till stamp'd by consent and Custom. I suppose, he has got some History of Words, an original Contract by which it appears that Words were in being long before they signified any thing, and cou'd not then be pronounced articulately for want of Signification: though I find a Man may pronounce a Word very articulately, which he knows not the meaning of. To the same End he goes on with great Gravity, to shew, what never any doubted of, that Words were capable of representing our Thoughts, simple and Complex: And then, what no

Body can Believe, that this must of necessity be done, by Accidents, whereas we see by our own Language, and those of others, that for Instance, Prepositions are capable of representing Relations betwixt Thing, and Thing, or Thought, and Thought. And these, I suppose, are no Accidents; at least he cannot call them so, who allows them for different *Parts of Speech*. And then proceeds *Thus* we by *Steps* proceed to the *Point in Hand*; and at last with a peculiar modesty concludes *Thus quietly, thus easily* are grand debates brought to an *Issue*, when matters are fairly stated, and set in a true *Light*. He calls a *Part of Speech* a being made up of *Accidents*, P. 26. and P. 27. says of an *Adjective* It must be joyn'd to the *Substantive*, and how this can be done without *Case*, *Gender*, and *Number*, *Accidents* necessary in *Construction*, is past my *Understanding*; and commends the *Definition* of a *Participle* upon this score, that these *Accidents* are enumerated in it. 'Twill be too much for me to meddle with whats past my Brother's *Understanding*. But I fancy the Reader may understand how we do it in *English* every *Day*, and how the *Latins* did it in undeclinable *Adjectives*. 'Twere easy to follow, and expose him in all his *Ramblings*, if good manners wou'd suffer the *Patience* and *Understanding* of the Reader to be so insulted. But since that must not be, I shall only ask him a few *Questions*. First, What *Part of Speech* *Fas* is by these notions, whether it have the same *Accidents* with *Jus*? Secondly, What *Part of Speech* *Quatuor* is, whether it hath the same *Accidents* with *Tres*? Whether in *Centum* *Millia*, and *Centena* *Millia*, the Words *Centum* and *Centena* be different *Parts of Speech*? *Centum* and *Ducenti* whether they agree in *Accidents*, or, because they disagree, whether they are different *Parts of Speech*? And yet my Brother is so fond of this *Extravagance*, that as he defines all *Parts of Speech* by them, as necessary in *Construction*, and that cannot *abesse sine subjecti interitu*, yet last *Accidents* still, so in his loose *Description* of an *Adjective*, that its *Signification* is *Relative*, and respects the *Substantive*; he adds, And then the *Adjective's* having three *Genders*, three different *Declensions*, being capable of *Comparison*, are so many more special *Accidents* necessary in *Construction*. Now here I wou'd fain know the *Declension*, *Gender*, and *Comparison* of *Tot*, *quot*, *quatuor*, and the numerals to *Centum* inclusive. How are *Romanus*, *Aureus*, &c. *Grastinus*, *Hesterinus*, &c. *Bimius*, *Trimus*, &c. *Duplex*, *Triplex*, *Legitimus* compar'd? But enough of this in all *Conscience*. The next Thing to be enquir'd is, whether the *Participle* be under the *Adjective*, *Why*, I say aye, and therefore you may be

sure my Brother Symes says no. As for my Reasons, I refer to the *Animadversion*: My Brother's are P. 23. *Are their Accidents exactly the same? No: It is peculiar to the Participle to signify Time, Action, Passion, and being. It is therefore a different Part of Speech from the Adjective. Aye and different Parts of Speech from one another too, if this reasoning be good. And so we have three Parts of Speech for one in this Case only. Indeed he is so far here consistent with himself, that it is no more, than what he contends for in the Verb, P. 21. 22. That Verbs of several Significations and several Terminations, shou'd be deem'd several Parts of Speech. What are the several Kinds of Verbs, but several kind of Words too. To Instance particularly in the Verb Sum with its Compounds. Is not the Signification peculiar, the Declining singular, the Use proper, and different from other Verbs, and are not these Accidents necessary in Construction? To cover this Mistake, a Definition is contrived by way of Comprehension, uniting Parts of Speech of different Predicaments, &c. At this Rate there will be, I cannot presently say how many, but at least above a hundred several Parts of Speech of the Verbs only. A Man might teach the Language as soon as the Parts of Speech this Way, for ought I know. Cicero wou'd have told him, *hoc non dividere, sed frangere est*. I will not stand with him for impropriety of Expression in the Participle's Signification of Time. I'll suppose him to mean, as he shou'd have said *Adsignification*, or *Consignification*; otherwise *Craftinus*, and other *Adjectives* of time will fall in with it. Well, take it as it shou'd have been. The Participle *ad-signifies* Time. This say I does not unadjective the Participle since it agrees with the Adjective in the general notion of denominating a *Substantive*, any more than the like *Adsignification* of Time unsubstansives the Infinitive Mood in *Vigilasse sum*. I wou'd have told him who had said so, if he had been civil. I say a trotting Horse denominates the Substantive, as much as a white Horse. The Reply is, 'What in the name of Sense does this Author mean by 'a trotting Horse denominating a Substantive? Is *Horse* 'a Participle too to denominate the Substantive? As much 'as trotting taken for a Quality, or Habit? Well, I will take Care what I answer, because I find I must do it in the name of *Sense*. There is a difference, I own between a trotting Horse, and a Horse trotting: A prating Fellow, and a Fellow Prating. But not so much in this Latter, because some prating Fellows will always be a Prating. Is there not a difference too betwixt black and white, and are they therefore different Parts of Speech? whether therefore trotting Horse, or Horse trotting, they both denominate the Substantive.*

stantive, the general notion of an Adjective : the only difference is in the Adsignification of Time, which cannot exclude the Participle from the Adjective, any more than *Agilasse* from the Substantive, in which there is the like Adsignification of Time. But to say a trotting Horse denominates the Substantive is not Sense, he insinuates. For he says is *Horse* a Participle? Why not that I know of, I can't tell what it may come to be, by my Brother's Definitions. But is not Horse denominated in this Expression, does not the Expression then denominate him, though it does something more, name him too? But my Brother says, not too fast, Time is not the only difference. Well, fair and softly, with all my Heart, let's hear then. The Signification of Action, Passion, and Being is another Essential Difference. What are these no Adjectives that signify either Action, Passion, or Being? What are *Agilis*, *Actuosus*, *Tolerabilis* *Patibilis*, *Præsent*, *Falsiloquus*, *Quarum verum te falsiloquum mihi esse nolo* with a great deal more of Passive Signification. See Reader, we are come to the same Point again in a trice, and that not too fast, but my Brother's Pace. Time therefore is the only difference in Signification between the Adjective and the Participle, which is all I affirm'd.

Let us now take my Brother at his own Weapon, his Accidents I mean, which is a bold venture with so great a Champion : However let us try. What are the Accidents of an Adjective in my Brother's Judgment? Pray observe, And then the Adjective's having three Genders, three different Declensions, being Capable of Comparison, are so many more special Accidents necessary in Construction; and all (if not each) are abundantly sufficient to distinguish the Adjective from the Substantive, and render it a different Part of Speech, P. 23. I find my Brother is doubtful here, whether each of these different Accidents, may not make a different Part of Speech. Well then it may equally be doubted whether the same Accident do not make the same Part of Speech. He cannot then be positive that the Participle is not the same Part of Speech with the Adjective, since it has at least one of these Accidents, namely, three different Declensions in common with it. *Amans*, *amantis*, and *amatus*, *amata*, *amatum*. And then for Genders, another of his special Accidents necessary in Construction, as special as they are to the Adjective, the Participle has them all, and conforms them likewise to the Substantive. Special Specialys these two! There remains comparison. And are all Adjectives capable of that? Or are all Participles incapable? The first has been disprov'd already. The latter, the Comparison of the Participle is made out by *Possius*, and because I perceive by

by his next Remark upon Gender, that he can find nothing in that Author, but what I point to him, let him look. *Anal. L. 4. C. 15.* There he will find the Comparison of the *Participle* is made out by *Vossius*. Some of his Instances are, *Armatusissimus*, *Commendatissimus*, *Cognitor*. And what difference there is betwixt them and the *Participles*, *Armatus*, *Commendatus*, *Cognitus*, but in their being compar'd, I confess, I see not. The whole of the matter seems to be this, that not only *Adjectives*, as my Brother affirms, but all *Parts of Speech*, signifying Things in which there may be an Excess, may be compar'd either by Postposition, or Preposition, that is by changing the Termination, or premitting a Sign of Comparison, as *magis*, or *maximè*, which latter is as proper Comparison as the former, and that in the *Stile of Lully*, *quem nolumus defamari*. And if the *Verb* may be compar'd, notwithstanding its Adsignification of Time, as *Magis amat*, *magis studet*, I see not how the *Participle* can be excluded. And this comparing by *Magis* and *Maximè* is all the Comparison some *Adjectives* have, which yet are equally capable of being compar'd by their Signification, of which the *Commentarys* will furnish my Brother with a plentiful List. It appears therefore that the Adsignification of Time is the only difference betwixt the *Participle* and the *Adjective*; and if that will make different *Parts of Speech*, it will with as good reason make the *Verb* and the *Participle* one *Part of Speech*; which is more than my Brother has yet affirm'd.

But he says, If he have erred, he is the more excusable, because walking in a Path untrodden, without Guide, or Light. Why, I believe as much, he was out of the way, and in the dark. He should have took a Link then.

After *Animadversion* the 4th. The Objection here is, that my *Notions* are odd and provoking, and there is an Excuse made for me, I thank him, that I have written a great deal, and in hast. I shall only desire the Reader to consider, that my Brother has written a little, and in a great deal of Time, and so pass on to the matter of Provocation. The first provoking Notion is, that I define a *Pronoun* to be a *Word* that signifies a *Person* primarily, secondarily a *Thing*. Now this is *Priscians* Definition, and not that of *Vossius*, in which, I confess, I was mistaken. The only Difference is, that *Priscian* says, *Personam recipit* (*Vossius* supposes it should rather be read *respicit*) but his censure is *Nec propriè pronomen personam recipit, sed significat*. My Brother says the *Pronoun* *Primario Nomen respicit*, not *significat*. And so at last we are come to a *Part of Speech* that signifies nothing. But he says the *Pronoun* does not always

always signifie or respect a Person; for *qui* may repeat *homo*, or *equus*. Well was *Priscian* ignorant of this think you? I suppose not, but he meant either a Person strictly so call'd, or Things spoken of particularly, which are as it were then spoken of personally. For by the Ancients defining of a Pronoun to signify, respect, or receive Personam they meant by *personam*, *rem per se unam*, which is my notion of it, and as Provoking as it is, I will venture to leave it to shift for it self. Let my Brother shew me a Pronoun that does not denote a particular in the respect there spoken of, namely, a Particular Genus, a particular Species, or a particular Individual, and I knock under the Table.

But he says, if mine be a good Definition of a Pronoun, that it signifies primarily a Person, secondarily a Thing, and Person be a Thing, as being capable of being the Subject of a Verb, which Thing it never is, he says, (witness *ego* and *tu* I suppose) 'tis in effect to say, Pronomen *id quod primario rem significat, secundario vero rem*. Now what shall a Man do with such a terrible Logician, such a Whipster as this? Why e'en have recourse to the old Distinction of *Laxior et strictior Significatio*, and then Person is Thing in the first Sense, but not in the second; and so all's well again. O that I could but say *Thus easily, thus quietly!* but that's Meat for my Master. But what? Are *Ego*, and *Tu* incapable of being the Subjects of predication? We see they actually are predicated of: And whether that be, that they are properly Substantives, or Substantivated by Use, what has my Brother Symes to say? He cannot call them so much as Originally Adjectives by his Principles, since they have neither Gender, nor Comparison, two of his special Accidents of an Adjective necessary in Construction. But of this more when we come to speak of his Remarks upon the *Animadversion* on proper Names or Nouns. The next Thing that offends him upon this Head is, that I say this Part of Speech is in order of Nature the first Noun. And here we have a learned Discourse about the order of Nature, and a Quotation out of *Sanderson's Logick* to pin the Basket. Upon which the Descant is, *If then the Pronoun is in Order of Nature the first Noun, it must be thus: That the Existence of a Pronoun does not imply or suppose the Existence of a Noun; but the Existence of a Noun does imply the Existence of a Pronoun. As two in the Example, may be without Three, Animal without homine but not vice Versa*. Well, any thing in the World for Peace, and Quietness sake, we'll take my Brother at his own Lay. And to oblige him, I will for once say,

that the Existence of a *Pronoun* does not suppose that of a *Noun*, (a proper *Noun* I mean, for that is it which a *Pronoun* stands for, in the natural Order, or necessity of Speech: But that the Existence of a *Noun* does suppose that of a *Pronoun*. To prove this I shall make use of that exploded instance of *Adam*, and *Eve*, which my Brother makes himself so merry with, and upon which he has this notable Observation, That the Nature of the *Pronoun* was not changed by the Fall. If *Adam* and *Eve* had then no need of other names than *Pronouns* to represent one another by to one another, it follows that the Existence of the *pronoun* does not imply that of the *Noun*: And if they were call'd *Adam*, and *Eve*, with respect to this, or that Singular, as they certainly were; then *Adam* and *Eve* imply the *Pronouns*, *this*, *that*, *he*, *she*, &c. By which they might be call'd before they were *Adam* and *Eve*. My Brother has been at a Gossiping 'tis plain by his Talk, has he never been at a Christning? What says the Minister there? Why, name *this* Child. First a *Pronoun* we see, and then *John* I baptize thee. But he says, *Eve* was call'd *Woman* from her *Birth*. Well, 'tis the first time I ever heard of *Adams* being brought a Bed, and I thank my Brother for being so Communicative. If he would turn his studies this Way, what further Discoverys might we expect! But she was call'd *Women* however from her first being, *Woman*! Aye marry! Great News indeed! What then? Why then, If the *Noun* would contend for this priority, he would carry it; for *Adam* had given Names to all living Creatures before *Eve* was Created, and she was call'd *Woman* at her *Birth*. What before they might be particularly nam'd by *Pronouns*. I'll be up with you, with my *he*, *she*, *this*, *that*, &c. Call Things by what proper Name you will, or as soon as you can for your Life Brother. But what signifies *Adam's* giving Names to all living Creatures before *Eve* was born, it it must be so. These Creatures were in Being, it appears, some Time before they were nam'd, and might be spoken of in particular, either as to their Kinds, or the Particulars of them, during that Time. What should they be call'd by then for Distinction but the Help of a *pronoun*, when as yet they had no particular Name? And yet, this is brought as an Argument here, that the *Noun* was, before the *Pronoun*; or if you please before it sent, for that it will do as soon as 't'other. Is any thing more natural, than to suppose *Adam* to have said to himself upon the Case; what shall I call *this*? What shall I call *that*? Do not we naturally do so, when we have things to name, or meet with things which

we

we suppose to have names, though unknown to us? What's this? What's that? Vossius gives the Pronoun the Priority upon this Consideration. This is what we are upon now is the Notion of Vossius. *nostrum multo melioris utroq;*

And whatever Liberty he takes with me, it little becomes him, as he does in Effect, to pour that contempt upon Vossius in common with me.

But he says; I take it for granted, and I believe Mr. Johnson himself is not so bent upon Contradiction, so stiff and obstinacious of an Assertion, as to deny, that a Noun may be without a Pronoun supplied; which is no more, than that a Thing may have a Name without being shewn or rehearsed.

Now however Mr. Johnson is bent upon Contradiction, he is so bent upon Distinction, as to lay a Thing cannot have a Name without a Capacity of being shewn or rehearsed, which generally is, always May be done by the Pronoun, which makes it always equal with the Noun, and it has been shewn in some Cases to be before it.

It follows, But how a Pronoun can be (as the Word imports, and the Nature of it is to be) in the Place of a Noun, without supposing the Noun to have a Place; how a Proxy can be without a Principal, a Prince or Viceroy without a King, or Royal Authority, are Mysteries, are Riddles, harder than ever Oedipus Solv'd.

Well now, if my Brother Symes's Character would make a great Man, O drive I for a Riddle, Oedipus was nothing to me; for I fancy I have a Way to solve all this. The Pronoun is not in the Place of the Noun, as its Deputy or Proxy, but as its equal, and to the whole Simile is impertinent. And now I hope the Riddle is out to the Reader, and I am a brave Fellow by my Brother Symes's Keckoning; the Mischief on't is I cannot say.

Latius sum Laudari abs te pater laudato viro.

But the Man's Character is good for nothing, and I am just where he found me.

After Animadversion the 6. The great Cinch here is that I derive Genus from Geno, and that I make the Female a begetter.

Now I will not undertake to be so skilful in Heraldry, in which I understand nothing, as to Blazon a Derivation with my Brother. But why not Genus from Geno? The Dictionarys derive it, as it seems from Genor, but with just as much reason as from Geno. Well, I have had a small Opinion of these Dictionarys a good while: I shall have now less than ever. They'll serve to do me a Mischief I find, but never a Kindness. In *Emineo*, &c. they are against

me, and there they are *Armamentaria coeli*, batter down all before 'em. Here they are for me, but meer *Bruta Fulmina*, my Brother Symes dare turn up at them.

But again, why not *Genus* from *Geno*? Why because, *Genius*, *Genitus*, and *Genitura* are the only *Verbals*. Why *Genius* more than *Genus*, and why not *Genitor*, *Genitrix*, as well as *Genitura*? Why Lion King at Arms will have it so, and how dares any other Beast dispute it? Why not *Genitain* *Genitabilis* as well as *Genitus*. Why for the Reason above, or, *Stat Pro ratione Voluntas*.

But secondly, I make the Female a *Regetter*, and this, is put twice into a Parenthesis to shew the absurdity. Well, and so does Virgil — *Qui tanti talem genuere Parentes?* *Æn.* 1. V. 610. again 10. 547. *Quid Mater invisum fati genus?* *G.* 4. 324. and so almost all Authors. And if my Brother has any Scruples about the English, for my part I know no more of these Matters than other People, if he will have any more, he must go to the Cooks.

After *Animadversion* 7th. My Brother has no Mercy upon this *Animadversion*. He tells me of defining Gender as no Body ever defin'd it. To this I answer, the Question here is not whose, but what. Beside *Vossius* has defin'd it as I have done. *Est quidem Genus Grammaticis non discrimen secundum sexum, sed secundum sexus notam.* *A. L. 1. C. 9.* And yet Brother says, there is no such Definition in *Vossius*, but that I Father it upon him to Countenance my own, and then commend it. This deserves a Rebuke which for the Readers sake I will spare my Brother. But what must a Man be traduc'd for Forgery, because he can't find it in either of his Editions, some sixpenny ones I suppose, for such there are for the Use of Children? I have now quoted him Book and Chapter, which he complains for want of. Let him see the Title of the Chapter, which begins *Genus Grammaticis non tam signare sexus discrimen, quam ejus discriminis notam.* If he will be but caution'd from hence to read a little before he writes, 'tis to be hop'd we may be troubl'd no more with him. But he says *Vossius* does not mean by *sexus notam* the Termination of the Adjective, but that the *Amotators* misled me into this Mistake, by that false Maxim of theirs, *Sane propter structuram solam traditur Generis Doctrina, quare si nulla essent Adjectiva, vel ea semper unius essent Terminationis, inanis ac supervacua esset omnis hac de generibus disputatio.* Now these are the very Words of *Vossius* Chapter and Book above quoted, and along with the Notion transcrib'd by the *Amotators*. And in this agree with *Vossius* exactly *Daneshius*, and *Messieurs de Port Royal*, car si tous les Adjectifs n'avoient qu'une seule Termination

minaison en chaque cas, cette connoissance des genres seroit inutile, parce que cette terminaison conviendrait a tous les Genres. Vid. also Danes: L. i. . 10. It appears therefore against my Brother, that *Vossius* by *sexus notum* means expressly the Termination of the Adjective; and that Brother is full of nothing but himself, an *Almanzor* of the Quill.

*He that dares write at random, and let Fly,
And nothing read, yet dares write on, am I.*

Now what says this self same Brother of mine in another Place, where he has me to oppose? Why the very self same in Effect that I do here. 'Tis P. 49. wheretaking me up for excepting against giving the Rules for the Genders of Nouns in Latin, he says, *But if he means by Rules (as indeed he does, though improperly) the Preceptive Parts, Examples & Exceptions, taken altogether, Then I say, his Exception, that they are given in Latin, is absurd. For can English Words make Latin Examples? Or can Exceptions to Latin Words, as to Gender, be express'd in English, a Language without Gender?* Why look you there now. The English Language has no Gender. What not *Man* and *Woman*, *Horse* and *Mare*, *Bull* and *Cow*? Yes, what then? He must mean sure, because the Adjectives have but one Termination, that the Consideration of Gender concerns not a *Grammatian* in the structure of the Substantive and Adjective: And therefore Gender in the Substantive, as necessary in *Grammar*, is nothing but an Affection that requires a particular Conformation in the Termination of the Adjective. And now again, is it not a thousand Pity we two should fall out. But for all this my Brother fancies he has some pleasant Conceits upon my Definition of Gender. He says, *It is not Gender that Mr. Johnson Defines, but somewhat instead of Gender.* And, so that what he offers here is somewhat instead of a Definition. Now wou'd one think that this which is so very Pert, shou'd be so very dull too? But you see Reader it is my Brother's Way, and every *Man* in his Way you know. This *Animadversion* sets forth that all Nouns have not Gender in the Sense of *Lily's* Definition, *sexus Discretio*, Nay that Multitudes have it not. And my Brother and I are agreed I think by what is cited from him, that in those that have Gender, the *Grammatian* considers it upon Account of the structure with the Different Termination of the Adjective. It must follow therefore says the *Animadversion*, that Gender in this Sense is no general Affection, or Property of a Noun to be consider'd by a *Grammatian*, but a means to find out some general Affection, namely, the Inclination

inclination of the Substantive to this, or that Termination in the same Case of its Adjective, which be as some Substantives have Gender, and in such this Inclination is found out by the Gender, the *Grammarians* have thought fit to call by the Name of Gender, which I shall therefore treat of under that Term, only desiring the Reader to bear in Mind the former Distinction. To those that have the *Commentary*, I shall leave the *Animadversion* to defend it self: And for those that have them not, and yet shall happen upon this Squabble, I hope this Extra out of the *Animadversion* will justify me against this sorry Cavil. All the Fault here is, that I put in a right Nation instead of a wrong one, and then denie by it, which bring an Offence, that my Brother is secure I shall never catch him in, he has no Mercy.

The last Fetch is upon the Word *Inclination*, in the Definition of Gender. *Viz. Gender is the Inclination of a Substantive to one, or more Terminations in the Case of its Adjective.* And here he desires to be inform'd, he says, what I mean by the *Inclination, leaning, or stooping* of a Substantive to the Termination of the Adjective. The Substantive stands upright, is absolute in its Signification, with Gender inherent, and independent of the Adjective; which Adjective is Relative, depending on, and therefore servilely conformable to the Substantive. Again, The Adjective therefore, particularly as to Gender inclines to the Substantive. And indeed what need has the Substantive of bending in this Respect, since he can have all his Sex distinguished without help of the Adjective? A doubtful Criticism this! As if any Body could doubt, whether any thing more were intended by *Inclination* here, than by *amare, admittere, exigere, gaudere, pascere, postulare, respirare, Velle*, the common Language of *Grammarians* upon these Occasions, and always signifying what I here intend, when they are apply'd to Words; namely that the Word requires such a Constitution, or we are required by Use so to constitute it. But I fancy I see where the Gound of all lies, my Brother is a mettlesome Man, a Substantive in the literal Sense, stands by himself, and by himself he will stand. He will not venture being unsubstanciv'd by *Inclining, Learning, or Stooping* to any Thing, no not reason it self. And so having no hopes to bend or *Incline* him, I have done with him upon this Head.

After *Animadversion* 8. We have seen my Brother's Reasoning, we are come now to his Reading too. This is the fourth Qualification which he puts down in his Preface for a compleat Grammarian. *Fourthly, A compleat Grammarian should be well Vers'd, and perfectly acquainted with almost*

all Roman Authors, but especially the best and most Authentick. 'Tis pity this elevated Understanding of my Brother was not better improv'd by this necessary Qualification of Reading. But it may be after all my Brother's Flourishes of his Understanding, he makes wise, as they say in Devonshire, i. e. Puts upon us: He knows better Things of it himself, that it will not answer the Pains and Charge of Reading, and therefore by the same good Husbandry with the Squire in the Canto.

Wisely resolved to lay forth

No more upon it than 'twas worth, As appears by the Sequel. I say the proper names of Things are but Adjectives. This Notion, he says, I snatch'd from the Annotators who make Proper Names of Months only to be Adjectives, and that falsely. And after, if the Annotators Mr. Johnson, or any body else had produc'd such an instance as *Calendæ Decembres*, or *Idus Maij*, where the Concord proves the Adjective, the Matter had been out of dispute. But instead of that to find *Calendæ Decembres* and *Idus Maij* byasses me to believe them Substantives. Well, if Mr. Johnson cannot do this he will confess himself an Eternal Blockhead, If he had read any one of his two *Vossius's*, he would have seen that he calls them Adjectives in three several Places, if no more. And might have known also, that the Annotators snatch from *Vossius*, almost all they say, and that therefore there was no necessity of my snatching from them. And now to the Point. I find these sort of Expressions 117 Times in *Cicero*, 57 Times in *Livy*, 19 in *Pliny*, 6 in *Columella*, and 17 *Palladius*: In all, to spare him other Authors, 276. I shall give him some Examples of them without expiess Quotations, that he may see what he can find of them in the *Delphins Indexes*, which he says have been so serviceable to me in this Work. And then having pegg'd him fast in this Point, I shall leave him with *Hindbrass* in the Stocks, to

Comfort himself with Ends of Verse,

And sayings of Philosophers.

' Ut Idibus Septembribus P. Quinctium sibi Pronitteret.
' Nimitum ad Calendæ Junias. Nonæ sunt hodiè sextiles.
' Idus Januarias. Calendæ Martias. Kal. Februarias. O Nonæ illæ Decembres. Descendere Kalendis Januarijs. Ex Kalendis Januarijs, usq; ad Kalendas Majas. Ante Idus Martias. Per Idus Quinctileis. Idibus Martijs te leduxit. Ante diem XIII Kalendas Januarias. Ex Kalendis Januarijs ad hanc horam. In nonas Majas dies producta esset. Idibus Maijs senatus frequens. Mecumq; assidue usq; Idus Martias. Iunium. pridie Idus Octobres. Kalendis Septembrib: Idus
' Aprilis

* Apriles. Dies erat adscripta Nonarum Aprilium. Idibus
 * Quintilibus dedicata est. Idibus Decembribus Magistrat-
 * um occipere. Qui Calendis Octobribus Magistratum oc-
 * ciperent. Calendis Quintilibus. Calendas Junas.

I would willingly make my Brother good Measure, but because no Body, beside himself, can be suppos'd to be so Ignorant, for fear of affronting the Reader, I shall stop here. These are all from Authors most Authentick upon my honest Word, and I would have quoted them expiely, but that I thought it would be of more Service to my Brother to put him upon Reading, especially upon a Subject, where nothing will do without it. He has adventur'd to write upon the *Ratio* of a Language without reading *Grammarians*, or Original Writers. It puts me in Mind of honest *Dick Fisher*, who being a Principal Farmer in the Parish, born to a hundred Pound a Year of his own, and coming to a *Justices* Clerk to write out his Attestment, being ask'd how it came to pass, that a Fellow in his Circumstances cou'd not write? Answer'd very readily, *Why yes I can write, so I can, that I can: But I can't read, so I can't, that I can't.* My Brother says, He that shou'd make a good Grammar deserves his Statue in Brass. And I say, that he who writes of Grammar, and knows nothing on't, if he have any Statue, one Part at least should be brass. I beg my Brother's Pardon *quem nec de facie novi*. But if he cou'd not find in his Heart to read these lumbering Authors, these Scurvy great Books, that are good for nothing but to keep a Gentleman from his Diversion; cou'd he not read *Horace*, a Wit like himself? though not To the Tune of true *Daffys Elixir*, true *Spirits of Scurvy-grass*. What says he?

*Martijus Coelebs quid agam Calendis? and
 Incolumem tibi me praestant Septembribus horis:
 Cum tibi Nona redeunt Decembres.*

Age libertate Decembri — Utere.

And now let him try what he can make of his Extraordinary Fetch upon this Head, namely, that if *December* were an Adjective possessive, we should say in English *December's Month*, if any other Adjective, *December Month*. If I might be so bold, as after my Brother to ask a Question in the Name of Sense, it shou'd be this, How he infers *December* to be a Substantive from our not saying *December's*, or *December Month*? would *December Month* make it an Adjective? Why yes, that's suppos'd by the Argumentation. Well, once more then, by your leave good Brother, In the Name of Sense aforesaid, how come you to affirm, that, if the Proper Names of Months were Adjectives, they were the

the only Ones; the rest were all Substantives? We honest People here say *Nottingham Town*, and think no harm. And I have heard of *London Town*, or for more stately tone *London City*. In the same Simplicity of our Hearts we say likewise *Trent River*, and your Friend *Horace* comes to your Terms, changes the Accidents, *Metaurum Flumen Rhenum Flumen*, and so do others: what doe you think of *Terra Asia*, *Terra Africa*, *Terra Italia*, *Terra Gracia*, &c? And if it be necessary, as you wou'd make it, see what a spot of Work you have cut out for your self, and us. A Boy at this Rare must know the whole *Latin Tongue*, before he can know the Parts of Speech. And though he shou'd prove another *Symes*, which you know but few are like to do, yet *experto crede*, you know he must be Fifty Years old, before he can tell whether the *Proper Name* of a Month be a Substantive, or an Adjective. But I make all proper Names Adjectives. Why, what should I make them? One, one Part of Speech, and another, another? At this Rate, we must have as many Parts of Speech, as there are Words differing, though never so little, in Signification: And then Grammar, which as an Art, consists of Generals, is at one Blow brought all to Particulars.

In *Chaos Antiquum Confundimur*. My Brother confesses there are *Pronouns* Adjective, why not *Proper Names* then? I see no such Difference betwixt them. A *Pronoun* is us'd to particularize a Thing; so is a *proper Name*. All the Difference is, this latter does it by a stated name apply'd to some certain Things: the former by a General one, applicable to any Particular by shewing or rehearsing. There are *Pronouns* Adjective, where is the Wonder that *proper Names* should be so too? But they have no Difference of Terminations conform to Gender. Yes they all have, as much as some *Latin Adjectives*, it appears, and as all *English*. Nay some of them have different Terminations with Substantives of different Gender, *Mensis Maij*. *Idus Maia*. *Metaurus Rhenus*. *Furius*; *Metaurum Rhenum Flumen*. And as for those that are never apply'd but to one Substantive, I cannot imagin what could let any Man a looking for their Gender. But my Brother will Argue, it may be, from this Comparison of the *Proper Name* with the *Pronoun*, that I overthrow my own Doctrine. For there are *Pronouns* Substantive, whereas I allow of no *Proper Names* Substantive. Now if my Brother could keep Counsel, I'de tell him a Secret, and that is, that I take all *Pronouns* to be Adjectives. What *Ego* and *Tu*, he'll say? yes verily. For 'tis by my Spectacles an odd notion, not to say provoking, to make *Ego* one Part of Speech, and *Ille* another, namely,

D

that

that the same Person spoken of by himself, and by another shou'd be two different Parts of Speech, because the one has Terminations different in Gender, and yet all the while own with *Vossius* that Signification is *Forma essentialis et quasi anima Vocis*. I will quote him a Passage out of that Author full to this Purpose. 'Significationem qui addunt (i. e. ut nomini accidens) similiter produunt quam hospites sint in differendi disciplina. Nam quid nominum atq; adeo omnis vocis, quatenus ex instructo aliquid notat, forma erit essentialis, si significatio non est? Ut non magis ea accidens nominis esse possit, quam anima est hominis affectio. Quare qui non videt, eius Explicationem, ad alteram Grammatices partem, quæ Exegeticè dicitur, pertinere: is cum *Sceledro Plautino* perhiberi potest non magis oculis uti, quam si *loliio* victitaret. Imò elucus sit, cui hic alâ luce sit opus.

I suppose by this Time the Reader has a Sample of the Man, and his Belly full of this sort of Entertainment. Wherefore waving his further Impertinences upon this *Animadversion*, I shall give only one Instance of his Insolence, and another Piece of Ignorance not much Inferior to this last, and so have done with him. 'Tis Page 64. 65. upon the word *Acus*. What says Mr. Dogmatic think you? Why, *Acus* is rightly translated a Needle, if the Translator knew that it signified Chaff too in *Colum*: he was the wiser to take no Notice of it. If all *Columella's* old fashion'd Words must be quoted against General Rules, 'tis impossible to make a Complete Grammar.

'*Acus Aceris* Neuter is the known received word for Chaff, if *Columella* has *Acus* Feminine of the Fourth Declension, not a Man will follow him; Was he the wiser to take no notice of it? The more Fool *Vossius* then, who takes notice of it, and makes it an Exception. And now, whether wiser than my Brother, or not, is too much for me to say, but here is one Man however, such as he is, that will follow *Columella* in it. Attamen Fallitur cum aiunt eum, qualiter loquatur Βαλβυλίζει. Nam apud *Columellam* de palea quoq; in Feminino, et quarta legimus. *Voss*: An: L. 1. C. 21, Eur, Why must we not follow *Columella*? Because of his old fashion'd Words. Old Fashion'd! This Man never read this Author, 'tis as plain as the Day. For no Body has fewer. But my Brother goes on to illustrate the Matter.

Terence, he says, is a much purer, and more Authentic Author, and yet he that shou'd after him use *Decet vobis*, *Functus est Officium*, &c. wou'd be as ridiculous, as if he wore a Ruff, and Pantaloon in our Age. What a Figure my Brother wou'd make

make in a *Ruff* I know not, and what he makes in a *Band* I know not. I suppose it must needs be very fine, because, he is afraid of changing. But if we must be in the Fashion, (out of the Fashion, out of the World) have our *Lips drawn as they wear 'em*, as the Painter propos'd to the Lady, I would beg of my Brother, that lives in London, to send us the Mode into the Country. We have nothing here but a Company of old fashion'd Authors in *Ruff* and *Pan'doons*, *Plautus* and *Terence*, *Livy*, *Sallust*, *Justin*, *Tacitus*, *Agellius*, *Suetonius*, *Ausonius*. I'll lay the Case before him, and trusting to his good Nature (for I am sure of his Ability to write new fashion'd *Latin*) I'll order my Taylor, when he comes up to Town for the Fashions, to call upon my Brother for a Pattern. And that my Brother may have no suspicion of sinister Designs, I promise him I'll charge the Fellow not to make Measures of it. But to defend our selves for the Time past, till this new Fashion be made Publick; *Vossius* having produc'd four Examples, two of *Plautus*, two of *Terence*, of the Verb *decet's* Governing a Dative Case, adds from *Donatus*. *Antiqui inquit, si addebant statim Verbum facere, nos decet facere dicebant. Si non addebant, nobis decet, dicebant. Sed si hoc est, quod ait hoc loco Donatus, natus erit Sermo, nobis decet, ut convenit nobis: At, decet nos erit in Latino, quia facere intelligitur. Et mihi quidem attendenti propriam Significationem tam Latini decet, quam Græci ἀρμόζει, omnino videtur, non tam Hellenismus, quam Convenientia utriusq; sermonis, cuius Causa non tam ab arbitrio hominis, quam rerum natura, debeat arcessi. Sanè in alijs quoq; linguis, ubi casuum discrimen apertum est, dandi casum hic videas sociari.* Then he quotes from *Sallust*, *Locum editionem quam Victorinus, decebat.* From *Livy*, *Decet principi terrarum populo, et tanto regi.* Another out of *Paulus*, a fourth from *Apuleius*, a fifth and sixth from *Agellius*, with the Encomium of *Castissimi Scriptoris*. And if there were no more than the Authority of *Terence*, I could tell him of a Place in *Tully* (he will presently find it by his Index) where that alone is set so high, that it is appeal'd to by *Tully* himself in justification of an Expression, which being something singular, had been condemned as bad Latin. *Secutus sum*, says he. *Non Cæcilium (nilus enim auctor Latinitatis est) sed Terentium, cujus Fabella propter elegantiam sermonis putabantur ab Latio scribi.* Now Fashions being set by Quality, till we know my Brother by some Superior Title, who can blame us for following these Authors, rather than the Master of St. Saviours. As for *Punctus Offici-*

um his next in a *Ruff* and *Pantalcons*, I refer him to *Vossius de Constructione* C. 22. Where beside *Plautus* and *Terence*, he proves it from *Nepos*, and *Tacitus*, in this last twice. I add also *Suetonius* Aug. 35. *Quo lecti religiosius, et minore molestia senatoria Munera fungerentur*, And, 45. *Petitâ veniâ, commendatisq; qui suam vicem fungerentur*. He makes himself very merry in one Place with going to the Stake, and thither he must go in good earnest, when this is publish'd, it may be like a Bear to the Stake too. His Comfort is, that, however he may be Baited, his Neighbours always take care of the Bear, and as a Friend in their Hands I leave him.

p. 17. l. 39. After 'tis *Sicani Dele* and that is Feminine, as well as Masculine.

p. 18. l. 10. After Gender Add: *Soracte* is Neuter, as *Vides ut alta Stet nive candidum*

Soracte. Hor: od: 9. l. 1. But *Pliny* has

Soractem N. H. 7. 2. and *Soracten* 31. 2. in the Accusative; by which it appears to have been us'd in two Declensions, and cannot be Neuter in either Place.

p. 19. l. 36. After Termination Add: and in *Terence* we find

Ubi illic Scelus est, qui me perdidit, Andr. 3. 5,

P. 21, l. 12, After - mination Add: I find since, *ut receptus Croto Brutiorum esset*, Liv. 3, 4, p. 501.

p. 29. l. 21. After N. H. l. 19. C. Ult: Add: *Genera ejus duo: Trauston Masculi Thuris Magnitudine*. Plin: N. H. 12. 23. *Altera cumila Thuris Odorem habet, quam Liba noridem appellamus*. Plin. N. H. 20. 16,

p. 29. After l. ult. Adde. *Vossius* is of Opinion that *Cicero* us'd *Oleaster* in the Fem. *ac suspendi jussit in oleastro quadam*. And so it is, he says, in the best Editions, those of *Stevens*, *Nannius*, *Paulus Manutius*; concluding, *Solus legendum censet in oleastro quodam Lambinus, sed in vitis libb*. However, *Pliny* has, *Olympia Oleaster ex quo primus Hercules coronatus est, Et nunc custoditur religiose*. N. H. l. 16. c. 44.

p. 30. l. 15. After *Utero repertas* Add. *Hunc* (i. e. *lacertam*) *marem prehendi*. Plin. N. H. 30. 15.

p. 30. l. 16. After *Prehendi* in the last Addition Add, All invariables are not always Neuter; for *Noctu* is an invariable, and Feminine. So *Vossius* cites it in Three Examples from *Ennius* and C. *Quadriger*. And so I find it in *Plautus*.

Mihi haud falsum evenit somnium, quod Noctu hac somniavi. Plaut. Mil. 2. 4.

But

- But then *Cato* has *Noctu Sercno*. R. R. C. 156. and
Cic. ipsa Noctu. A T. 8. 3.
- p. 31. l. 23. After, *Parasanga Dele Tiara*:
- p. 32. l. 1. After, body knows Add: *Tiara* ends in *a* also in
 Greek. That which misled me was, *Virgil's Sacer tiaras*.
 Which I suppose, however, he borrowed from the Greeks,
 though our *Lexicon's* give no account of it; *Latin* Au-
 thors never changing a Greek, into *as*, that I know of.
- p. 32. l. 19. After, *Et si dies sit dubium* Add: *Coles* shou'd
 have been excepted here as well as it *Consignificant Penis*
Coles ad ventrem delgandus est. Celf. 6. 18. and often else-
 where. Nor will it be impertinent to take notice of
Colis, or *Coles* (for I see it not in the Nominative) for
Caulis, Masculine also in *Cato*, *Varro*, and *Columella*,
 this last frequently.
- p. 34. l. 9. After *Chamacissos* and its Example Add:
Cissanthemos pota. Plin. N. H. 25. 14.
- p. 34. l. 10. After *Cyclaminos* and its Example Add: *Cycla-*
minos pota. Id. 26. 8, 26. 11.
Cyclamino admisto. Id. 29. 3. But this may be from
Cyclaminum Neuter, which is to be found in the same Au-
Si Cyclaminum adjiciatur & sulphur. 28. 11.
- p. 34. After,
Crethmos, &c. Add:
Crataegonos. est & alia Crataegonos. Plin. N. H.
 27. 8. *Eadem Sanat ulcera*. Id. Ib.
 After,
Eos. Add:
Holochrysos in vino pota. Plin. N. H. 21. 20.
- p. 34. l. 30. After *Sandastros* and its Example Add: *Spodos*
illota. Plin. N. H. 34. 13.
- p. 37. l. 25. Add: But Dr. *Shaw*, says the Physicians, do not make
Bolus Feminine, unless for a sort of Earth. The other
Bolus is Masculine with them. I did not take it from
 their Books, but had been told so by an Eminent Phy-
 sician.
- p. 38. l. 5. After N. H. l. 26 C. 11. add: *Centunculus de-*
cocta Id: 26. 11. But then he has in another Place, *Idem*
sanguinem sistit tritus cum &c. 24. 15.
- L. 37. After *tali Medela Ser*: add: But *Pliny* never uses
 it but in the Masculine: *Tithymali medentur cum se-*
samie sumpri. 26. 11. And so C. 8, to the several
 Kinds of it, he adds the Masculine Adjectives
Paralius, *Characias*, &c. from *Dioscor*: L. 4. C. 165
- p. 38. l. 23. After *Crocos* Add
Quotq; ferat dicam terra Cilissa Crocos. Ov. in Ib.
- p. 38. l. 33. After *Nardo Assyria* Hor. L. 2. od. 11. Add:
Papyrus

Papyro galla prius Macerato Plin. 34. 11. and *ex ipso quidem Papyro navigia texunt*, Id: 12. 11. But this is from the nominative *Papyrus* us'd in the same Place just before.

p. 40, l. 6. After by Example Adde:

Arsegonon, Thelygonon Alij utramq; Ocimo similem tradunt.
Plin. N. H. 26, Ult:

p. 40, l. 18. After *Distamnium* and its Example Add:
Dodecatheum pota. Plin: 26, 11.

p. 40, l. 21. After *Geranion* and its Example Add; *Geranion in albo Vino posum*, Plin: 26: Ult:

p. 40, l. 22. After *Heliotropium* and its Example Adde
Hypericon Eadem praestat, quam alij Chamapytin, alij, Corion appellant: in the Margin Corissum: Plin. N. H.
26, 8. *Est aliud Hypericon quod alii Corin appellant*, Id: 1b:

p. 40, l. 29. After *Satyron* and its Example Add: *Altera Satyron.* Plin: 26. 10.

p. 40, After *Satyron* in the Additions Add:

Solanum, At simul reprimunt ac refrigerant, herba Musa's serpyllum - solanum quam Struchnon Graci Vocant:
Cels: 2 33.

p. 44, l. 40. After N. H. 1, 8. C, 8 Add And so does
Celsus, Clunes repellenda sunt 7. 29.

p. 49, l. 28. After *Colum: 1, 12. C. 4. Add: Plautus alio*
has penum neuter, Dicam ut sibi penum aliud ornet, Capt.
ac: 4. Sc. Ult:

p. 51, l. 16, After *Plilocomasium* Add:

Interpres is Feminine in Seneca mala interpres Opinio in-
contrarium iraducit Ben. 4, 21.

p. 53, l. 23. After no Adjective with it Add: But I see since
this corrected among the Errata, where he makes it
Masculine, but without Authority.

p. 55, l. 25. After but in the nominative, Add: The Ob-
jection here is, that there is *semis* declined. But
how does that appear? *Semissis* may be the Nomi-
native of all the Obliques *Semissis, Semisseni, Semisse,*
Semissimum, Semissibus, for ought we know, Stephens lays
Hic Semissis; And *Vossius* lays, *Censeo ego aliud esse se-*
mis, aliud semissis. And presently *Quare semissis quidem*
quod dicitur, quasi semis assis, ad regulam pertinet Gene-
ralem: semis autem inter terminata in is locum sibi vindicat pe-
culiare. I must confess I know no *semissis* in the No-
minative, but I know not why I should contradict
such Writers as these, when I cannot disprove them.
Beside *Centussis, Decussis* are quoted as Nominatives by
the best Dictionaries. I have prov'd against *Vossius*
and might confirm it from *Celsus L. 5. C. 18. that*
semis

semis is not us'd only in the *Nominative* as he supposes, but in the *Accusative*: I have since found Examples of it in the *Genitive*, *Trabeculam pedum Vigeni trium*, & *semissis imposito*. Cato. R. R. c. 18. *Latitudine pedum duorum* & *Semis*. Pall. Jan. 10. and soon after *Altitudine trium*, vel *duorum*, & *Semis pedum*. Also in the *Ablative*, *Paciemus tribus pedibus altas*, *duobus semis latus*. Id. Ib. I find one common mistake in this matter, and that is, that, if we wou'd speak of the half of any thing in general, we must use *semis* invariable; because *semissem*, &c. always signify Money. But Columella has *In duos pedes* & *semissem convertitur humus*. 2. 5. And Plin. *Si minus, proscindere semissem iterare assen*. N. H. 18. 19. And Palladius *Unius* & *semissis modij farina per praedictos dies saginam replebit*. R. R. 1. 29.

p. 55. l. 4. From the bottom After for the Herb, Add: But Celsus has this latter in the Masculine, *cui Rhus, quem syriacum vocant, aut amaranuces adjecta sunt*. 6. 11.

p. 56. l. 15. After *illa vorat*, Add *Alecem ex jecore eorum excogitare provocavit*. Plin. N. H. 9. 17.

p. 56. l. 16. Dele both.

p. 57. l. 18. After Seneca quotes him, Add: Ep. 108 and so Lucretius,

Tu mihi suprema praescripta ad candida calcis

Currenti spatium prae monstrata callida Musa. L. 6. p. 173.

p. 58. l. 8. For *Delos lege Delphos*. This Town was also nam'd *Delphos* contrary to general belief.

Hac mihi si Delphos, Dodonaq; dicerat ipsa,

Esse videtur vanus uterq; locus. Ov. Tr. 4.8.

p. 60. l. ult. Add: *Fulix* is of this special Rule and Feminine *Cana fulix* itidem *fugiens è gurgite ponti*

Nunciat, horribiles clamans instare procellas. Cic. Div.

1. p. 161. the same with Virgil's *Fulica*.

p. 61. l. 3. From the bottom After l. 9. c. 25. Add: Though this probably may be upon the account of *Piscis* in the beginning of the Chapter, *Est parvus admodum piscis asfuetus patris Echenis appellatus*: For in another place he makes it Feminine. *Tamen omnia hac pariterq; eodem impellentia, unus, ac parvus admodum pisciculus Echenis appellatus, in se tenet*. L. 32. c. 1. And then presently *Hac tantilla est satis contra tot impetus*. But then here are various Readings in the Margin, viz. *Hic tantillus*, vet *Hac tantilla vis est*, alij vet. *Hoc tantulo satis est*. Ch.

p. 61. l. 7. From the bottom Add Mr. Leed's has a great scruple here, whether *Cenchris* be of this Special Rule, or no. But Pliny has, *Cenchridis* & *Cenchridi* for the Bird. L. 10 c. 52. L. 29. c. 6. And though he has *Cenchrin* in the

the *Accusative*, for the *Serpent*. L. 20. c. 22. Yet that is no Objection to its encreasing in other cases, the *Accusative* in these Nouns, in *is* being often non crescent, when other obliques encrease. However, this Masculine Gender is imply'd by none of *Lilly's Rules*.

- P. 62. After *Animadversion* 29. Add. The Termination *ys* shou'd have been made Feminine too. For so are all that they borrow of that kind. *Admista Cachry ex vino*. Plin. 22. 22. But then if my Book be right, he has also *Admista Cachry aut Polio*. 27. 13. Let the Reader examine it.
- P. 63. l. 16. After *En*: only Add: So says *Vossius*, but I find it also in *Corn. Severus*. *Purpureog; rubens surgat jubar aureus ostro*.
- P. 64. l. 6. After *Menech*: ac: 3, Sc: 3. add: This indeed should have been under the 2d special Rule as increasing long, and it is the only Obligation I have to my Brother *Symes*.
- P. 65. To Line the last add: I find since that *Pliny* has *Meridiana cardine silva hebero maxime virent*: L. 6. C. 30. So 'tis in *Dr Shaws Book*, as well as mine; let the Reader satisfy himself.
- P. 66. l. 12. From the Bottom, after *cortice nudat* add: And so *Columella*, et *corticem robustam habet* de Arb: C. 26:
- P. 72. l. 23. After *Past*: 1, p. 5. add: *Dei. amian Stat*: Ach: 5, v. 82.
- P. 73. l. 26. After unheard of, add: But since I find my Mistake
Cui latus *Euphrata*, cui *Cassia* limina mander. Stat: Theb: 8, v. 291. And *Ut existant per hujusmodi stellarum concursiones, et similitudines Socrata simul, et Antisthena et Platonis multi*. Agel, 14. 1. which being so correct a Writer, and diligent a Searcher into Antiquity, makes me conclude that this was the Custom of the best Authors, though not so frequent, as to be seen oftner in those few Remains of their Writings that have come to us.
- P. 80. After the last Line Add: But this is singular: for these Nouns in *eus* are commonly declin'd by the Latins either after the Greek form *Orpheus, Orpheos, Orphei*; or *Orpheus, Orphei, Orpheo*: as *inferias Orphei mitti*. Virg: G, 4. *Quamvis adsit Orphei Calliopea* Id: Ecl: 4. *Quid Mater profuit Orpheo*. Ov: Amor: 3. 6.
- P. 84. l. 10. After *pro Rab*: p. 619. Add: And from *Ennius Coniectores somnium Div*. 1.
- P. 84. l. 11. Dele the whole Line and the Piece following.
P, 84,

- P. 84, l, 18. After no such Contraction Add : in Substantives.
- P. 84, After *Animadversion* 42, Add : *Fabrorum, Procorum, Duorum Virorum, trium Virorum, decem Virorum* are condemn'd by Cicero, and their Contracts only allow'd. *Fam* (*ut censoria tabula loquuntur*) *fabrum et procum* audeo dicere, non *fabrorum et procorum*, planeq; *duorum Virorum* *Judicium*, aut *trium Virorum Capitalium*, aut *decem Virorum* *libris* *Judicandis* dico nunquam Cic. *Orat* : ad: M : Brut : p, 187 : Yet *Liv* : has *fabrorum* 1, p. 39. and *Plin* : L, 3. Ep : 19. But *Presedus fabrum* is only current with all but *Plin* : N, H, 36, 6. *Presedum fabrorum, Quindecim Virorum* *Hor* : *Car* : *Sec*.
- P. 84, After *Animadversion* 36, Add : The Genitive Plur : is often contracted in numerals as *Millenium Navium* *Plaut* : *Bacc* 4 : 9 : And *Trinum Nundinum* *praedita die* : *Cic* : *pro* *Dom* : p, 52.
- P. 84. After *Animadversion* 43, Add : *postquam morte datus est Plautus*, *Agel*, 1, 24. There are also of this Declension some Nouns that have different Ways of declining, as *Requies, Requiem* and *Requiem* in the Accusative : For the first see *Cicero* *Leg* : 2, p. 331. and *Fam* : Ep : 14, L, 5. for the latter *Suet* : *Tib* : and others. *Iter, Itineris, Fecur, Fecinoris* are irregulars also, and so is *Juriter, Jovis* all in appearance : But all depends upon two Nominative Cases, *Viz* : *Iter, Itineris* : *Iter* *Itineris* : *Fecur* or *Fecur, Fecoris* : *Fecinor, Fecinoris*, and *Jovis* in the Nominative instead of *Juriter* to be found in *A. el* : and *Higinus*. I had almost forgot to say that *Plebes* in the Gen : *sing* : frequently makes *Plebei*.
- P, 85, l, 5. From the Bottom after L, 10, Ep : 10, Add : *Bilbilm* in *Hispantia*, *Plin* : 34, 14.
- p, 87, l, 3. From the Bottom for *navim*, read *navim*.
- P, 88, l, 6, From the Bottom after *impari dicimus* Add : *Stamus* also has *separe coetu* for the like Reason, *Theb* : 4, V, 481 :
- P, 90, After *Animadversion* 47, Add : I have since found *Quinquatria* twice, *Suet Dom* : 4. *Celebrabat et in Albano quotannis Quinquatria Minnerva*, And *nec te decipiant ceteris Quinquatria cera*, *Od* : *Am* : 1, *El* : 8,
- P, 92, l, 23. After *Annotators* Add : The learned Mr. Wm. Turner Master of Stamford School has sent me a Correction here of *Ablatives* absolute in some of them indisputable, as
- Quot venis Idais fama est e montibus altis*
Dispersos ignis orienti lumine cerni, *Lucr* : 5, V, 461.
Membraq; Desiciunt fugienti languida Vita, *Ibid* : 686.

I have observ'd also in Sall: *Austo mari, et vento gliscenti*, p. 152, and *recenti tamen re mederi facilius* est, Cels: 7. 7.

Dico omnibus (*tube praesenti*) in concio e, Plaut: *Pseud*: 1, 1.

And that *Ablatives* in e of *Adjectives* comparative may be joyn'd to *Neuter Substantives*, he has convinc'd by abundance of Instances, and I have since found as many more, as in *superiore Exempto* Cic: *Invi*: 2, p. 66, *Detriora tempore*, Id: *pro Quint*: p. 219. &c. *Vetere* is also joyn'd with a *neuter Substantive* as he proves by several Instances, and I also find particu-

larly in *Liuy*, *Veterum confilio condendum Urbes*: L, 1, p. 6, and others: Also *Adjectives* in *ans* and *ens* to end in e with *neuters* in the Poets, *distantes* *fra* 10: *Ov*:

Met: 11, V, 715; *Vemente telo*, Id: *Met*: 12, V, 359, &c.: *Koffius* and *Mr Walker* misled me here, in these rare Instances, and as for the *Comparatives*, a common Gate, they were not in my Head.

P. 92, l. 7. From the Bottom, After: rarely, Add: Beside these I have since found *Bili* Cic: T, Q, p. 3082. *Concal*: *li* Var: R, R, L, 1. *Laudi* *Agel*: 15, 22, *Ter*: *Plin*: 28, 8, 31, 3. and *Ut accusatori aqua et* &c. *interdiceret* Tac: *An*: 12, p. 289.

P. 93, After *Animadversion* 50, Add: There is one Noun of this Declension *Non-crescent* in the singular, and *get crescent* in the whole Plural *Vu*, *ius*, *ii*, *rim*, and *Vires*, &c. But this is not perpetual. For Sall: has *maie assuetum ad omnis* *Vis controrsarum*, *Hist*: 3, p. 150, and *Lucr*: *Vis multus* L. 2. again,

Sed quasi multa *Vis* unius cortoris extant, L, 3, p. 71.

P. 97. After *Animadversion* 55, Add:

Gram: L, p. 25.

Quorum *Genitivi* plurales desinunt in *ium* accusativum nominant per os et eis diphthongum, ut *partium*, *Omnium*: *Partes omnes* vel *eis*.

Animadversion

These Nouns have also is in the *Accusative*, and that very frequently in the best Authors. *Plautus* has 88 instances of it; *Sall*: and *Tac*: a great many, and even *Cicero* himself as publish'd by *Gratius*. *Tis* for *Tres* is a common Thing with him. *Tis* most common in *Adjectives*, but abundance of *Substantives* end so too, and several in *Cicero*. The only question is, whether they ever have is in the *Nominative*. But of that there are two Proofs, *Libera sunt* *Edis* *Plaut*: *Mil*: 3, 1, *Cum omnis domus* *de* *latorum* *interpretationibus* *subverterentur*: *Tac*: *An*: 3, 126. As to *Genitives* in

ium, *Jurium* from *Jus* might have been added from *Plaut*: *Ep*: 3, 4. *Carnium* from *Caro* looks something strange, but *Carnis* seems to have been the old Nominative from that of *Liv*, *Quod Laurentibus carnis, qua dari debet, da non fuerat*; *Dec*: 3, *L*, 7, p. 935.

P, 99, After *Animaverfion* 56, Add: Here should have been some account of the Genitives of Greeks in *es* which may be in *z*, as well as *is*; *Themistocli fuga* *Cic*: *Fam*: 5, 12, *O. o. i. regis*, *Id*: *Ib*: 15, 1. &c.

P, 100, After *Animaverfion* 56, Add: Mr *Leeds* was pleas'd to move a mighty Question, whether *server* admitted *aerem* in the *Aer aere*, and a certain learned Schoolmaster wrote me Word that he had found it in *Varronius*: But there is no need of such authority, the best Authors have it, *Ipsam, quo vivitur, aerem in perniciem vertimus*, *Plin*: *N*, *H*, 18, 1 *Purum aerem*, 2, 23, *deeca N*, 2, four times 1, 3, 2, 29, 3, 14, 7, 24. *Cels*: 3, 7, 4, 7.

P, 101, After *Animaverfion* 57, add: Here should have been some notice taken, or some where else at least, of *Ego eros*, of which *Vossius* addend: to p: 277. *Sed Ego eros* qui *Pa. i. i. s. Cabricornus*, *sequitur secundam i, e*, contrary to *no. o. eros*, *Rhino eros*, for so it is introduc'd: and Mr *Leeds* after him p, 27. *Ubi Ego eros facit Ego eros* is in *Gen*: *desideratur exemplum*. He follows *Vossius* to be iure, and *Vossius* grounds upon *German*: in *Ara dis*, *cum selem Ego eros*, *Cythereus attitit*, and *Lut*: 10. *Ego eros* *cancrumq; tenet*. But this was no more than what was usual, to decline Greek Nouns sometime after their own manner, not excluding the Greek Declension, as in *Jo Dido*, *Minor*, *Oedius*. *Lucretius* declines as the Greek, *Qua facto estivis e partibus Ego eros Brutalis alea fevus*, 5, p, 147. At this rate one might argue there were no saying *Ti. a. es*, because *Plaut*: says, *Ti. a. i. Quai Ti. a. n. cum dis lili. erem* *Pest*: 1, 1.

P, 101, l, 8. From the Bottom, after *N*, *H*, *L*, 19, *C*, 4. Add: *Vossius* therefore was too hasty, when he condemn'd the Italian Poet for *Adoni* in the Dative

Dum Venus extindo sensu oscula fiit Adoni: Nay *Plautus* makes it of the second, *Uti aquia calamitum rapere*, aut *Venus Adonem*, *Men*: 1, 2.

P, 105, l, 14, After *L*, 5, p, 57, add: *Elim*: *Plin*: 16, 10.

P, 107, l, 21, After *Car*: 9, Add: Mr *Leeds* moves a notable Question here about the Declension of *Co. i. e.*

- Now *Tacitus* declines it as by the Examples following: *Accusatus in senatu ab Uxore Cotys damnatur: An: 2, p. 101. Partem filio Cotys permittit, Id: Ib: p. 99. Occidi Cotyn jubet, Id: Ib: p. 100, Statim a Cotys dimissa sunt, Id: Ib: which are the Places Mr Leedes refers to. But Suet: has Cotij in the Gen: Tib: C, 26.*
- P, 109, l, 16, After *Inachi filia* C, 155. So *Iliny Ob hoc Phaonem dilectum a Sappho, N, H, 22, 8.* But then *Plaut: has Quem Joni Juno custodem addidit, Aul, 3, 6.*
- P, 111, l, 22, After and elsewhere Add: *Me at altiorememoriam Oedipodis huc veniens - species quaedam commovit, Cic: Fin: 5, p. 248. Oedipodia confusa domus Stat: Theb: 1, V, 17.*
- P, 112, After *Animadversion 60* Add: Nouns in *ma* of this Declension make the Dative and Ablative Plural in *is* or *ibus*, as *Poematibus ad Her: 4, p. 23, Suet: Tib: 3, Cic: Off: 2, 105. is* is common.
- P, 114, After *Animadversion 61*, Add: *u* for *ui* in the Dative singular is common, *Luxu proprior, Tac: An: 3 129. Quo restituto, senatu auctoritatem resitutam putabamus, Cic: pro Dom: 506, so Venatu indulgent, vidu imigilant, Dominatu, ornatu* in the Dative are quoted by *Agel: out of C Caesar, saying that in his Books of Analogy he allow'd of no other Termination, Age: 34, 16. Plautus has Domu in the Abl: Mil: 2, 1. Hor: Dom: Dative.*
- P, 114, l, 18, I have found it since tho thrice in *Cels: L, 7, C, 16. Ab inferiore parte acubus venientibus: In duabus acubus fila trajicienda. Iemutatis inter manus acubus:*
- P, 115, After *Animadversion 62*, Add: *Domuum* or *Domorum* are indifferent, *Tecta domorum, Virg: domuum Tac: An: 1, 5, 7, and both in others:*
- P, 116, After l, 14, Add: *Balnea* ascrib'd to *Juvenal* only is also found in *Celsus, continua Balnea vitare, L, 1, C, 6.*
- P, 118, l, 12, After Degree Add: *Justinus* the Contract in the lieu of the *Abl:* as *ut nihil hostis Victor suarum rerum, praeter incendij spectaculum fueretur, L, 12, p. 150.*
- P, 119, l, 34, After *i, y, and u* Add: except *misy, sory*, which have *misyos, soryos* *Plin: 34, 12, and in Celsus* several times, but yet *Misy* in the *Ab:* consist *ex aumine scissili squama aris, Misy: 6, 14.*
- P, 119, l, 2, From the Bottom, After and Vocative Add: *Celsus* also puts it in lieu of the Genitive: *Farina oij semis. gith cyathos tres: 5, 18; again, Gith cyathi tres: 5, 28. and this I think, is a good authority to use all invariables so, where it will not obscure the Sense.*

P, 121, l, 11, From the Bottom, after Tac: An: 2, p, 74
Add:

Quis deus attonita fraudes astumq; parenti

Contulit? Stat: Ach: 2, V, 86:

P, 121, l, 14, After cannot find it, Add: This appears
since to be in the *Fragm: of Vulul: Ed: Gronovij:*
and *Alus* Nominative is in *Lucr: 5, 151:*

P, 122, l, 11, After Weight in general Add: Yet *Livy* has
triginta unum pondo: D, 4, L, 10, p, 1076.

P, 128, l, 11, After *paucula* Add: and this has the Plu-
ral, as *Equi, homines, pauculi, et graciles: Liv: Dec:*
4, L, 5, 881.

P, 129, l, 15, After *Opisve fuit:* Add: But I am convince'd
now it is in the Genitive by *cura* repeated out of the
former Verse:

Non mihi servorum, comites non cura parandi,

Non apta profugo vestis, opisve fuit.

P, 130, l, 6, After common Readers, Add: But I know
not whether *Ausonius* were not mistaken in this;
Quintilian a better Author in these matters has *fruges*
in the Nominative, *Primaq; ut fama est hostia causa pe-*
cuniae fuit laesa fruges, Dec: 13, p, 160; If my Book
be right.

P, 131, l, 9, After *Neminem* Add: and in *Cicero* also, In
sermone *se post Id: Mart: praterquam Lepiti, venisse*
neminis, At, 14, 1.

P, 134, After *Animadvertion* 71, Add: I know no Body
that has clear'd the Dative of *vis*, they generally speak
doubtfully of it, like this Author

Integra vox vis est, nisi desit forte Dativus:

The Author of the *African War* of *Caesar* will clear this
Doubt; *Quod postquam Caesar animadvertit, equitibus*
suis hostium ei oppositis, sarcinas legionarios in aerum
juber comortare, atq; celeriter signa hostibus inferre.

P, 137, l, 11, From the Bottom, After *us piscorum* Add:
Lentes and *Viris* Plural are found in *Ovid:*

Fore semel caso percunt virisq; sabaq;

Et percunt Lentes, astena Nie, iux Fast: 5 p, 24.

P, 138, l, 4, From the Bottom Add: *Amomum* also has
the Plural *Et in gelidos fudit amoma sinus, Ov: Pont:*
1, 10.

P, 139, l, 26, After *Auon:* *Idyl: 9,* Add: *Alga* enim et
piscis super feruntur ab imo atersa omnia Plin: N, H, 9, 15.

P, 139, l, 31, After *AuT: Alor:* Add: *Annagallides* mirè
profunt, Plin, N, H, 26, 8. Anshylli es dua: Id: 26, 15.

P, 140, l, 21, After *perpetuum ver:* Add: *Cumila* serpere
Orietur, 21, 12.

- p. 141, l. 15. After N, H, l. 19, C, 1. Add:
Ut careant lolijs oculos vitiantibus apri: Ov: Fast: 1, p. 23.
- p. 141, l. 10. From the Bottom after Tit: 13, Add:
Mustum Rustarum Plin 19, 3.
- p. 142, l. Cne, After *Auct*: Moret: Add: *Tibimali omnes*
 Plin: 26, 14. But here 'tis like, 'tis taken for the Flower,
 and so no Wonder it should be plural.
- p. 143, l. 17. After Pal: Jul: Tit: 4. Add: and so Plin:
 N, H, 11, 18.
- p. 144, l. 5. From the Bottom after Ov: Met: 1, p. 5.
 Add: *Atramenta*,
sed veluti tractata, notam labemq; remittunt
Atramenta, Hor: Ep: 1, L, 2.
- p. 145, l. 15. From the Bottom, Add: *Defruta* is found
 also Plin: N. H. 14. C. 21.
- p. 146, l. 6, After and others, Add: And no Wonder,
 since it is an *Adjective*, that it takes the number of
 its Substantive. *Ejulatione haud opus est, Oculis mustam*
(ie novam) miseriam addis Plaut: Capt: 2, 1.
- p. 146, l. 29. After Suet: in Vitell: Add: *sapae* Plin:
 14, 21. and *sputa, sputis* Cels, 2, 7. 2, 8.
- p. 146, l. 5. From the Bottom After no proof of it,
 Add: Dr Eusby has a Fancy that this is the only
 Plural Termination of this Word. But there are about
 twenty Proofs of *Vinis*, *rec à Vinis laduntur*, Plin: N.
 H, 13. 15, *Hac natura Vinis est*, and in *cateris Vinis*
commendandis. Id: 14, 4, &c. *Vinorum flammâ accendi-*
tur. 14, 6. *Et Venus in vinis fuit*, Ov: Ar: Am: 1: *Vi-*
nis oculis animiq; natabant. Id: Fast: 6.
Vinis in Statius comes in here, though Charisius, Diomedes,
Phocae, Vossius, and our Grammatian make *Vinus* sin-
 gular only.
- Quin et Thessalica felix Almetus ab oris*
Vix Steriles compefecit equas, Centaurica dicunt,
Semina credo, adeo incitantur, et omnis
In vincta adducta Venus. Theb: 6, V. 135.
- p. 147, l. 14. After Stat: 2, V 41, Add: *Bituminum*,
 Plin: 7, 15. *Bituminis* Margin.
- p. 147, l. 10. From the Bottom After Ib: 1, 12. C. 8. Add:
Larum also has the Plural.
- Pinguis cur illis gustentur larda Kalendis*. Ov. Fast: 6.
 p. 97.
- p. 147, l. 3. From the Bottom After, l. 28. C. 29. Add.
 Id: 11. 4. *Hanc testudinem quinq; decima luna capi oportet,*
ut plus pinguium veteriatur. Id: 32, 4.
- p. 148, l. 5. After l. 29. C. 1. Add: *Quibus pices Resinaq;*
profunt, Plin: N. H. 16. 12.

P. 152. l. 36. After and 165. Add: *Decores* also is found in
Lucr :

Scenarq; simul varios splendere Decores, L. 4. p. 121.

Foetores also is found in Plin; *Foetores emendari*. N.

H. 28. 8.

P. 156, l. 7. From the Bottom After l. 3. *od*; 11. Add:
ex dispari genere cultarum Cic; Inv. 2;

P. 158. l. 20. After *capillos denigrant* Add: *aut in quo sunt*
Galla, Cels: 5. 28.

P. 160. l. 21. *Dele*. *Glacies*. For it has the Plural.

Sous Hyperboreas Glacies, Tanaimq; nivalem

Lustrabat, Virg: Georg: 4. p. 91.

P. 160. l. 12. From the Bottom After *Memmij*, Add: *ca-*
num seabies sanantur: Plin: N. H. 28. 18.

P. 160 l. 5. From the Bottom *Dele*. who liv'd before Tully.

P. 161. l. 6. After *Oct*: Tit: 14. Add: *Celsus* also has
Species twice if the Lemma's be his l. 5, C. 28.

De vitiliginis speciebus, De impetiginis speciebus,

P. 179. l. 3. From the Bottom After needs no Proof, Add. I
am beholden to Dr Shaw for a Correction here. He
first sent me instances that *Vis* for Strength was us'd
singularly in the places following, *nigritq; natura in-*
dustriam hominum, quam vim, aut tempus deesse Sal;
Bell: Jug: and *Vis corporis melius ex renis, quam ex*
ipsa specie Astimatur, Cels: 2, 10. also 3, 2, 3, 6.
19, 27. 5. 26, &c,

P. 180. l. 2. After Plural Add:

Urbanitates. Habes ubi deponenda sunt Urbanitates, Cic: Fam:
16, 21, I have since found

Utilitates. Utilitatibus hominum genita, Plin. N. H. 22. Proem:
beside these abundance more of these sorts of plurals,
which let the Reader refer to their proper places.

Acerbitatibus. Quas tu in meis Acerbitatibus plurimas effudisti.
Cic: pro plane: 544.

Altitudines. Speluncarum concavas Altitudines, Cic: N. D. 2.
p. 89.

Ambitus. Sin valuerint Leges, ut ne sint Ambitus, Cic: Leg:
3. 364.

Amoenitates. Quae Amoenitates orarum et litorum, Cic. N. D.
2. 89.

Antiquitatum. In ijs ipsis Antiquitatum proemijis, Cic: A.
Q. 1. p. 80.

Aperitates. Saxorum Aperitates, Cic: N. D. 2, 89.

Brevitatum. Longitudinum et Brevitatum in sonis Judicium
Cic. Orat. 189.

Capivitatibus. Capivitatibus Lybium, Tac: His: 3, p. 600.

Cogen-

Cognitiones. *Cognitiones* quemadmodum nos moveant, Cic: Fin: 5, p. 273.

Conscientia. Te *Conscientia* stimulant malefactorum tuorum, Cic: Parad: 2. and pro: S. R. p. 234.

Consuetudines. *Consuetudines* sunt civibus inter se communes. Cic: Off: 1.

Cruciabilitatibus. Qui omnis homines supero, atq; antides *Cruciabilitatibus* animi Plaut: Cist: 2. 1.

Differentia Commonly Plural.

Distantias. Habere quasdam *Distantias* rufi coloris videtur, Agel: 2. 26.

Eminentia. *Eminentia* duae Id: 14. 3.

Fiducijs. Id versa: i in *tutelis*, *Societatibus*, *Fiducijs*, Cic: Off: 3. p. 125.

Gentilitates. *Laceras* *Gentilitates* colligere. Plin: Pan:

Gratij. } For Interest Cic: Contr: Rull: 425.

Gratiarum. } Id: ad Quirit: post red:

Immortalitatibus. Vi'e iurur ne virtutibus hominum isti honores habeanur, non *Immortalitatis*. Cic: N. D. 3, p. 134.

Immensitates. *Immensitates* camporum. Cic: N. D. 2. p. 89.

Inanitatibus. Qui saepe invenitur in *favorum* *Inanitatibus*. Plin: N. H. 11. 7.

Incolumitates. Eorum *Incolumitates* quibus salutem dedisti. Cic: pro Deiot:

Indulgentia. Quem non *Fortuna* *Indulgentia* molliant? Plin: Pan:

Lascivias. *Lascivias* *Elegorum* Auct: Dial: de Or:

Misericordias. habere *Misericordias* haud hominem oportet. Plaut: Most: 3. 2.

Opulentij. Quippe ego doctrinam anteire malim, quam copiam

Opulentij. Agel: 20. 5.

Paupertates. Nonius ex Varrone, p. 160,

Perennitates. Adhuc Fontium gelidas *Perennitates*, Cic: N. D. L. 2. p. 89.

Pulchritudines. Per alienas *Pulchritudines*. Plin: 37. 9.

Servitutum. *Auctoramenta* *Servitutum*. Sen: Ep: 104.

Valetudines. *Valetudines* februm, Plin: 23. 1. ad plurimos *Valetudinum* Usus. Id: 14. 8.

Valetudinum. Si non desint subsidia *Valetudinum*. Cic: T. Q. 5. 49.

Vetustatibus. Ex *Officijs*, ex religionibus, ex *Vetustatibus* habetur, Cic: Inv: 2. 74.

Violentias. Coercebatq; inter se *Violentias* doloris, Agel. 12. 5.

p. 181. L. 14. After Fast: 4. Add; One of my Friends complains that I don't produce coagula here out of Ovis I will do it therefore,

Mox epulis liquefacta coagula laffe. so Pliny has *Leporina* coagula, 28. 11. 10-Tib: 2. 3.

- p. 182. l. 4. After *loft* Add: Put I find since in *Ovid*.
Pinguia cur illis gustentur Larda Kalendis. Fast. 6. p. 97.
- p. 182. l. 15. After *Oed*: Ac: 2, Sc: 2. Add: *Albaq; porci*
Omenta Juv: 13. V. 117.
- p. 182. l. 28. After *are* singular only Add: *Robur* for
 Strength may be taken for singular only, but *Liuy*
 has *mediâ fere portâ Robora Legionem statuit*, Dec: 3.
 L. 5. *Hac sunt nostra Robora* Cic: At: 6, 5.
- p. 187. l. 12. After *appellant*, L. 1. p. 2, Add: Good autho-
 rity seems to be wanting for the singular of *Lares* by
 the account *Vossius* gives of it. All he says of it, is,
Usurpat Plaut: Aulul: *Etiam Pomponius, Atellanarum*
poeta, ut Gellius vocat, fabulam scripsit, cui nomen Lar
familiaris. Meminit Priscianus in 6. Uti et Apuleius, &
alii. Plautus alone would be authority enough for me,
 but for fear my Brother *Symes*, and the *Mody* Cri-
 ticks should cry out *Ruff* and *Pantaloous*, I shall prove
 it not to be out of Fashion. *Pauci essent reliqui, qui*
L. Metelli autoritate in agros atq; in suum Larem fa-
miliarem redirent. Cic: in Ver: Or: 8. p. 317. *Ad*
ipsum autem Libonem scripsit, nibi esse, nisi ad Larem su-
um liceret. Cic: Att: 16. 4. *Relinquent arationes? Re-*
linquent Larem familiarem suum? Cic: in Ver: 8, p.
 304. 'Tis needless in a Manner to say after this, that
Pliny, Virgil, Ovid, Juvenal, Martial, Tibullus all have it.
- p. 188, l. 49. After *maius moribus*. But since I find in
Seneca, Erras mi Lucili, si existimas nostri seculi esse vi-
tium luxuriam, et negligentiam boni moris, et alia quâ
objicit suis quisq; temporibus. Hominum sunt ista, non tem-
porum, Ep: 97.
- p. 192. l. 7. From the Bottom After *Pliny*, N. H. 36, 5.
 Add: and 34, 8.
- p. 194. l. 5. From the Bottom After often, use it so,
 Add: *Coribas* may look as odd in the singular, as
Nais, Eumenis, but as there is authority for both these,
 so also for *Corybas*, or *Coribas* in *Claud*.
Nec te progenitus Cybeleius are sonoro
Lustravit Coribas Claud: 3, Conf: Hon:
Conticere Chori: Coribas non impulit ensen, Id: Rapt:
 Prof:
- p. 194. l. 6. After *levitatis* Add: also *Pet*: Con: 299.
- p. 194. l. 18. After *Havus*: Resp: 5, 26. Add: so *Inv*:
 P. 37.
- p. 194. l. 16. After these Authorities Add:
Cantharides is by an ingenious person well seen in these
 matters suppos'd to have no singular, but I find in

- Pliny, est *Cantharis dictus scarabaeus parvus*, N. H. 18. 17.
- P. 196, l. 26. After *Capitale erat* Add: so L. 5. c. 4, 10. c. 11, 10. c. 73. 12. c. 1, 14. c. 22. twice. 17. c. 5. 18. c. 10, 22. c. 25. and in other places.
- P. 196, l. 32. After *de Senect*: p. 200. Add: also *pro Sext*, *Rose*: p. 235. and T. Q. 3. p. 383.
- P. 197, l. 19. After *panis inermi* Add: and so Celsus often.
- P. 200, l. 35. After *ac 1*: Sc: 1. Add: and so Pliny, and Celsus over and over each.
- P. 201, l. 12. 13. After these Authors Add: But Pliny has *Si superior salivâ palpebra tangatur*. N. H. 28. 4. and Celsus, *Si auris ima discissa est, vel bucca, vel palpebra*. 5. 26. also 6. 6. and 7. 7. and in the same Book *De pilis palpebrarum oculum irritantibus* it is to be found 12 times.
- P. 201, l. 18. After *pro Mil.* p. 323. Add: in like manner: *pro Deiotaro* p. 633, *post Red*: p. 498. *pro Marcello* p. 360. and *ad Fam*: 10. 31.
- P. 203, l. 21. After is plural only Add: *Vigilia* singular may be questioned by some, the Plural being more usual. And the Annotators have put it down among those that are rarely singular, unaccurately enough; because having several significations they do not distinguish betwixt them. It signifies *want of Sleep*, *Watch and ward by Night*, *And Pains*, and *Industry*. In the first Sence it is singular commonly in Celsus *ubi nocturnâ vigiliâ premitur*. 2. C. 4. *Multoq; magis si ita hac sunt, ut neq; vigilia praeceperit*: Id: Ib. c. 6. *Hunc ejus casum subsequitur tussis, continua vigilia* Id. L. 4, C. 7, *Cibus plenior, multa porio, post hac decumbatio, & vigilia*. Id: 1. 3. *Extenuat corpuscula vigilia*. Id. Ib: and elsewhere often. In the second Sence one need but look into Caesar to see *De primâ, secundâ, tertiâ vigilia, &c.* often. In the third Seneca has, *unam quamlibet rem vix ad perfectum adducit assidua vigilia, & intentio*. Sen: Ep: 69. *Cupio tibi vigiliam meam tradere*, Cic. Fam. 11. 24.
- P. 203, l. 25. After never otherwise than Plural, Add. But I find this is a mistake. For Celsus has it often in this signification in the singular. *Ideoq; vis corporis melius ex vanis, quam ex ipsâ specie aestimatur*. L: 2. c. 10. *Satius est enim primum levare agrum, deinde perpurpare, quam simul omni vi effusâ fortasse praecipitare*. Id: 2. 10, and often elsewhere. Sallust also uses it so, *Magisq; natura industriam hominum, quam vim, aut tempus creasse*. Bell: Jug:
- P. 204, l. 11. From the bottom After is mention'd Add: *Gerritilis*

Genitalia and *Naturalia*, suppos'd by some to have no singular, are but Adjectives to *membra*, and therefore have the singular, as well as *Membra*. *Ac prater genitale, et hoc in maribus tantum, viscera etiam omnia interiora ad exemplar.* Plin: N. H. L. 11, c. 44. again 7, 16, 20, 21. *per naturale descendit.* Cels: 5, 26, and 7, 26.

P. 206, l. 34, After Sen: Ben. l. 4, c. 31, Add: And Pliny has *menstruo* three times in one Chapter N. H. L. 28. c. 7.

P. 106, l. 36, After is omitted Add: For *Naturale* singular see *Genitale* above in the Additions p. 204.

P. 208, l. 9. From the bottom After shou'd not still be allowable Add: Nay Celsus has it *Qui, qua parte quodque viscus sit, non cognoverit.* Præf:

P. 209, l. 14, After Virg: Æn: 2. p. 121, Add:

Animus or *animi* for one mind

Hunc animis errorem detrahe nostris. Ov: Met:

P. 210, l. 18. After p. 96. Add: *Convictibus* in that of Ov: is equal to *convictu* Pont: 2, El: 10, though here frequent acts may be suppos'd, as in *judicijs* afterward.

P. 211, l. 36, After *Saturnus*. Id: Ib: *Judicijs* in those of Ovid is equal to *judicio*:

Judicijs debes esse superba viri. Trist: 5, 14. so de Pont: 4, 3.

P. 212, l. 28, After Ov: Met: p. 225, Add:

Pulmones or *Pulmo* are indifferent. *Latere caput Pulmones.* Cic: T. Q. 2. p. 365, *Sub eo pulmo est.* Plin. N. H. 11, 37.

P. 212, l. 24, *Ortus* or *Ortum*.

Et Clymene veros ait, edidit ortus i. e. Phæthontis. Ov: Met: 2.

P. 212, l. 42: After Id: Ib. p. 324. Add: so Cic: pro Cluent: p. 415, ad At: 6, 5.

P. 213, l. 20, After p. 66, Add: *Temporibus exactis ad patiendum.* Cic: Ver: 266.

P. 213, l. 10, From the bottom After Sen: Oct: Ac. 1 Sc. 3, Add:

Vias is no more than *viam* in that of Terence

Dum rus eo, coepi egomet mecum inter vias. Eun: 4, 2.

P. 214, l. last. Add: Mr Leeds was pleas'd to be displeas'd, that no more notice was taken here of the Declension of Adjectives, and I have had some Letters since upon the same account from others. What he meant I know not, but the Gentlemen are in doubt,

doubt, I find, of Adjectives in *er*, whether they have *is* also for the Masculine. But that is past dispute in the most of them, as

Atq; olacris palmas utraq; tetendit Virg : *Æn* :

Pons Milvius celebris, Tac : *An* : 14, p. 335.

Equestris tumultus à tergo, simul à castris clamor hostilis auditus. Liv. 3, 7.

Campestris locus. Col : 3, 13.

Ager palustris. Colum : 8, 14.

Salubris spiritus. Sen : *Contr* : 5, L, 5.

Salubrisne, an pestilens annus futurus sit. Cic : *Div* : 1, p, 209.

Syvestris ager Colum : 3, 11. 7, 2. 8, 11.

Acris and *Celeris* I could never find in the Masculine, only *Priscian* quotes the latter from *Cacilius*, and *Cato de Re Militari*. And therefore I doubt *Vossius's Acris Censor* *An* : 1, 26. is a step out of the way in point of Gender. That *er* in these Adjectives was formerly Feminine he proves from *Nævius*, and *Ennius*, but then he forgets that *Lucretius* also has *Celer origo*. L. 4, p, 99.

For a Neuter Termination of an Adjective in *es* in the Plural, there is found an instance in *Apellius*; *Violenta, inquit, & rapida Carneades dicebat, scita, & sereia Critolaus*. L, 7, c. 14.

Of Adjectives in *is* *Potis* is the only Heteroclite that I know, being of all Genders, and *Pote*, which is most commonly Neuter, being Masculine also. Nay, *Potis* is Plural also, and neither of them found but in the Nominative Case.

Nec potis est cerni (i. e. corpus) *quia cassum lumine fertur*. Lucr : p, 99.

Ita fiat, & isthoc, siquid potis est restitui. Ter : *Add* : 4, 1. 4, 4. Hec. 3, 3.

So *Carullus* ad *Lesbiam*. Car : 73. and *de Arme*. Car : 46.

Si vero dua (i. e. mulieres) *sat scio maxime uni*

Populo, cui lubet, plus satis dare potis sunt. Plaut : *Poen* : 1, 2.

Quod si hic pote fuisset nunc exorariet. Ter : *Phor* : 3, 3.

Of Adjectives in *or* it may be requir'd whether those compounded with *Color* have all Genders, but the doubt will be over upon sight of what follows, as *cauda pavoni, pluma versicolore columbes*. Cic : *Fin*. 3, p, 183, *Concolor cicatrix* Plin : 28, 9. and

Versicolorius armis. Virg.

Versico ori vestimento. Liv : D. 4. L. 3. p. 840. The great

great question is, whether they have the Neuter Termination in the Nom : and Acc: Plural. But this is resolv'd too by that of Pliny : *Tentatum est tingi linum quoq; Ec' vestium insaniam accipere in Alexandari magni primum classibus Indo annu navigantis : cum duces ejus ac praefecti in certamine quodam variassent insignia navium : stupueruntq; litora flatu versicoloria implente.*

N. 19. 1. Prior and Posterior bellum Punicum quoted by Priscian out of Valerius Antias, Cassius Hemina and Cl. Quadrigarius are followed by none of these Authors, and serve only to the reading Inscriptions, and other Antiquities. Gentiles in *as* ended formerly in *atis* and *are*, as appears by that of Plautus; *Quid? Sarfnatis ecqua est, si umbram non habes.* Most: 3. 2. as also by two Questions out of *Caes de originibus* in Priscian: but the general way in Tully's and Livy's time, was to contract *atis* into *as*, and give it all Genders, *In quo flexus est ad iter Arpinas.* Cic: At: 16. 13. so Livy: *Capenas bellum* L, 5. and *Pivernas bellum* L, 8. But that the Pronouns *Nostras*, *Vestras*, *Cujas* were by such contraction ever us'd is more than appears to me. I see nothing of them in the Nom: but only *Cuja's* in Plautus

Dic mihi quid cum nunc quaris, aut cujaris. Curc: Ac: 3. *Rogant cujaris sit.* Id: Men: 22. *Unde sit, cujaris, captane, an surrepta est:* Poen: Prol: Compounds from Verbs in *a* have all Genders: the Masculine, and Feminine I suppose no body will question, and for the Neuter there are these proofs,

Tempore ruricola patiens fit taurus aratri Ov: Trist: 4, 6. *neque vino alienigena usus.* Agel: 2, 25. But then it is worthy Observation, that these compounds from *Geno* are differently terminated by Authors, some using *gena* in the end of the first, others *genus* of the first and second, as, *singularem hunc Deus Mundum, atq; unigenam procreavit:* Cic: de Un: p. 372. *Nam cum cecigeni, solis qui lumina nunquam asperere.* Lur: 2, 52. *Omnigenos coctus.* Id: 5, 142. Compounds from *fero* have a double Termination, as *Pestifer civis.* Cic: pro Dom: *Pestiferus.* Celsus 2. 6.

p. 219, l. 28. Del: *Fucarus.* *Fucarius* Aufon: Id: 1, 4.
p. 219, l. 36. Del: *Luulentus.* *Luulentius.* Plaut: Poen: 1, 1.
p. 219, l. 37. Del: *Madidus.* *Madidior.* Plin: N. H. 27, 5,
p. 219. l. 38. Add: *Militaris.*
p. 219, l. 41. Add: *Obsequibilis.*
p. 220. l. 6. Del: *Versipellis.* *Versipelior.* Porc: Latr:

P. 120. l. 34. After *so*, again *Suas*; ult: Add:

Agilior, Plin: 4, 30.

p. 120. l. 48. After p. 25. Add:

Docilior. Dociliora sunt ingenia. Quint: Inf: 1, 12.

P. 121. After *Habilior* Add: *Habilissimus. Habilissima corpora.*
Sen: Tran: c. 8.

Ignabilior } see *Nobilior*.

Ignobilissimus }

After *Ignorabilior* Add:

Imitabilior. Neque est imitabilior alia. Plin: N. H. 37. 8.

After *Mobilissimus* Add:

Mutabilissimus. Mutabilissima sunt deorum voluntates Por: Lat:
in Cat.

Nobilior }

Nobilissimus }

are well enough known

P. 229, l. 14. After *ac*: 5, *Sc*: 6, Add: *Plautus* has *Confidentioquius* and *Mendaciloquius*, Trin: 1. 2.

P. 230, l. 7, From the Bottom, After *ac*: 1, *Sc*: 2, Add:

Quis de illius dignitate industrius? quis senam sapientis dixit, Cic: pro Dom. 509.

P. 237, After *Actuosior* &c, Add:

Aequalior. Nervositas filo aequalior, Plin: N. H. 19, 1.

After 1, ult. c. 2, Add:

Austerior. Colore austerior. Plin: N. H. 35, 11.

P. 238, After *Horridior*, &c, Add:

Glutinosior. Quo nihil est glutinosius. Plin: N. H. 24, 4.

P. 239, After *Latissimus*, &c. Add:

Peculiarior. Peculiarior splendet, Plin: N. H. 36, 20.

P. 240, l. 2, After *Just*: 1, 30, p. 254. Add:

Pudicior Martial. 2 Ep: 54, and others.

P. 240, l. 10, After and elsewhere Add:

Rukerrimus Celsus, 5, 22: 5, 28, and elsewhere.

P. 240, After *Scabrior*, &c, Add:

Secundissimus. Leves secundissimas plebi tulit. Liv: 1. 8.

P. 290.

After *Exrior*, &c, Add:

Sincerior. Sincerior multo, praestantiorque, Plin: N. H. 37, 8.

P. 240. l. 35, After *v*, 24, and others: Add:

Suprior. In arborum tonsura suprior, Plin: 17, 23, Man: 2, 6.

p. 241, l. 2, After *Quint*: 3, 8, Add:

Valgius. crus longius altero, Et valgius est. Cels: 8, 20,

P. 241. l. 4, After and elsewhere Add:

Ve, enissimus. Hoc intervallum temporis vegetissimum agricolis,
Plin: 18, 26.

P. 241, After *Vividior* &c. Add:

Vocalior

Vocalior. sunt alia, aliis Vocaliora Quin: Inf: 8, 3. so that it must be struck out of the list of them which have but one degree.

Unguinosior. Sicca unguinosiores. Plin: N. H. 23. 8.

P. 242, 1, 5. From the bottom After: Id: 1, 5, p. 168, So Plautus, si unum quicquid singillatim, & placide percurrat, Trin: 4, 2, so Cicero in Limone as Suet: cites him in the Character of Terence,

Quicquid loquens, ac omnia dulcia dicens,

P. 246, 1, 11, After *cujus ipsius*, Add: *Reapse, seipse* for *re ipsa, se ipse* are said to be us'd by Cicero in Seneca Ep: 108. from Fenestella, but I find not the latter: *Reapse* I read Fam. L, 9, Ep: 15.

P. 246, 1, 46, After Capt: Ac: 4. Sc: 2, Add: *Cuicquid* is also to be read in Cicero. *Tu ad me velim omnia quam diligentissime, cuicquid sunt scribar.* At: L, 3, Ep: 22, Neq; in populo lex dici potest, cuicquid fuerit illa, etiam si perniciosum aliquid populus acceperit: Div: 2, 324, so Agel: 20, 1. and Cic: T: Q: 3, p. 412.

P. 248, 1, 23. After Ter: Hec: Ac: 4. Sc: 1, Add: *quicum concordissime vixerat.* Cic: pro Rab: and at least a hundred times elsewhere. *Quare id quisque velim videas cum illa ut sit qui utamur,* Id: At: 11. 11.

P. 251. After Animadversion 97. Add: *mi* also for *mibi* is common in Cicero. Plautus also has *Tuatim facis, i. e. ex more tuo, tibi solita.* And *Hisce ergo tuaribus gratiam facias.* Trin: 2: 2. i. e. *qui partium tuarum sunt.* Sis for *suis*, which Vossius supposes to be found only in Ennius,

Postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Aeneas reliquit.

is found in Lucretius:

Denique non hinnitus item differre videtur,

Inter equas, ubi equus florente juventa,

Pinnigeri savit calcaribus ictus amoris,

Et fremitum patulis sub naribus edit ad arma:

Ac: cum sis alias concussis artibus hinnit, L, 5, p. 160.

P. 252, After Animadversion 98, Add: Of these Nouns see Add: to p. 214

P. 261, After 1, 30, Add:

Libet must also be a Personal by this Authors account at least, since Suetonius has

Cetera etiam, qua cuique libuissent, dilargitus est contra dicente nullo, Jul: c. 20.

P. 261, 1, 33. After Ben: 1, 3, c. 18, Add: several more instances there are of this Plurality. Sallust has *Li-*
cuerunt

cuerunt, P. 174, si meretricis impotentia omnia licent:
 Quint: Decl: 14, p. 168, Catull: twice, Sen: Ben: 7,
 7. Id: Clem: 1, 18, Conf: ad Pol: four times.

P. 262, 1, 31, After furori accessit, Add: Quod malè emittum
 est semper panitet. Plin: N, H, 18, 5. Et ne quidem
 hac conditio nunc non panitet. Plaut: Stich: 1, 1, Sed
 id sane me panitet. Agel: 13, 2. and 5, 1.

P. 263, 1, 26, After Plaut: Cal: Ac: 5. Sc: 2. Add: Qui
 assiduus concubinis depudere didicerat, Sen: in Sap: non
 cad: injur: c. 17. Axius de xii millibus pudens, Cic:
 At: 10, 15.

P. 268, 1, 7, After p. 29, Add: nec subigi queantur Pl:
 Pers: 2, 2.

P. 269, 1, 20. After Trin: Ac: 2. Sc: 2. Add:
 Aggredior. Hoc restiterat etiam, ut a te fisis aggredere
 dom: Cic: ad Nepotem ex Vossio.

Anteflor. Impubes libripens esse non potest, neq; ante-
 flari, Liv: from Priscian.

P. 269, 1, 20. After Trin: ac: 2, Sc: 2. Add:
 Arbitror. Condurso, Eburones, Caresos, Pamanos, qui
 uno nomine. Germani appellantur, arbitrari ad quadragma
 millia: Cas: B: G. L, 2. But here some Books have
 arbitrati; Let the Reader judge by the place whether
 it be Passive: I think that most probable.

P. 269, 1, 22. After as quoted by Priscian: Add:
 Assequor: is put down by Messieurs de Port Royal as one
 of these Verbs; what they alledge for it is an im-
 perfect quotation of their own out of Cicero, Nihil
 horum investigari, nihil assequi poterit. They name no
 place, and it has been more than trouble enough to
 me to find it. I make no doubt but it is part of
 this which follows. Ac, Ne forte ea, qua remota de
 medio, atque erepta vobis sunt, omnia ita condita fuisse,
 atque ita abdite latuisse videantur, ut hac diligentia,
 quam ego à me expectari maxime puto, nihil horum in-
 vestigare, nihil assequi poterit, &c. Cic: In Ver: Or: 4
 p. 299. The question here is, whether it shou'd be
 hac mea diligentia, or hac mea diligentia. And whether
 investigare, or investigari, and the best copies must de-
 termine the point.

P. 269, 1, 24. After Justin L. 30. p. 254. Add:
 Consequor. Serpentes parva fallunt, nec publice consequuntur.
 Seq: Clem: 1, 25.

Consolor. At cum animum, inquit vestrum erga me video,
 vehementer consolor. Agel: 15, 13, from Metellus Nu-
 midicus.

P. 269, 1, 35. After erat moderatissima Add:

Dispartior.

Dispersior. *Dispersitur enim per causas cunctas omnes, i. e. anima.* Luor: 3. p. 83.

P. 270. 1, 8. After An: 12. p. 273. Add:

Periclitor. *Utilissimi sunt in vuneribus quæ vermbus periclitantur.* Plin. 30. 12. and 32. 10.

Polliceor. *Nam ut aliis plerumq; obvenienti magistratu ob metum statua polliceantur.* Met: Numid: from Priscian.

Populor *Vossius* would prove to be of this kind, by *Qui nunc populati, atque vexari sape ad me venerunt.* Cic: in *Cecil:* and *populatam vexatamq; provinciam.* Cic: in *Verr:* 3. But this will not do, as will appear by and by. But there is good proof of it in that of *Livy, Uri sua, populariq; passi.* Dec: 1, L. 2, p. 88.

Fatur. *Fasti dies sunt, in quibus jus fatur.* Suet: 1 from Priscian.

P. 270, After 1. 6. from the bottom Add:

Ulcisor. *Quicquid sine sanguine cicum ulcisci nequitur.* Sal: B: 1: 69.

P. 270, After 1. ult: Add: *Vossius* would bring in *Loquor* for one from that of *Calvus* to *Cicero*, *De damnatione ferenter loqui est captum.* 8 *Fam:* If *captum est* be never found with an Infinitive Active, he is in the right on't. But whereas he wou'd establish the like use from allowable Authors in *Experior, Interpretor, Lator, Machinor, Meditor, Metor, Moderor, Modular, Molior, Nancisor, Oblivisor, Ordior, Pacisor, Precor, Testor, Veneror*, from their Participles in *tur, sus, dus*, that will not do by any means. Because the latter of these Participles is always Passive, and afforded by all Transitives in *or*, witness *Gloriandus, Imitandus, Loquendus, Utendus*, &c. and are form'd also from Verbs in *O*, as *Hæc suppis pereunda est probe.* *Plant:* *Si placeat uxor, placenda quoque dos est.*

The other are several of them us'd Passively, when the Verbs are not, as he in effect owns An: L. 4, c. 11. and every body that reads must own. *Executio regis inperio Just:* L. 7. is a proof of it, for *exequor* it self is never Passive. So *expertus* and several others.

P. 279. After *Animadversion* 106. Add: There are also, in speaking of the time past, some Cases observable in this Tense, namely, where it is equal to the Pretorfect or Preterimperfect; as,

Ut careo vobis Scythicas detrusus in ora;

Quatuor autumnos Pleias orta facit. Ov: Pont: 1, 9.

Ut sumus in Ponto. Id: Ib: 1, 10.

Quam dudum in portum venis. *Plant:* Stich: 4. 1. *Dum ego in Sicilia sum, statua dejecta est, i. e. dum fui.* For he was

then at Rome; Cic: in Verr: Or: p. 297. *Hunc conse-*
bat te esse credo, cum vocat te ad prandium: Plaut: Men:
Ac: 5. Se: 9. Namque illa cum te ad se vocabat, me
te esse credidit. Id: Ib: Eo credo quia non inconviliavi,
cum te emo Id: Pers: 5, 2.

P. 305. l. 13. After: l. 1, Sat: 6. Add: *Decoquitur quantum*
manus capiat, Plin: N.H. 25, 5. porusque quantum tribus
digitis capiatur. Id: 28. 8.

P. 316. After l. ult: Add: *Pergunt in castra Pratorianorum*
Cerius Severus, & Subrius Dexter—Si incipiens a huc, &
nondum adulta seditio flederetur. Tac: Hist: 1. p. 461.

P. 323. After Animadversion 115. Add: *Te si arbitrarem di-*
num missem tibi. Plaut: Pseud: 4. 2. Vocem ego te ad
eam, frater tuus nisi dixisset mihi Te apud se carnaturum
esse hodie Id: Stich: 411.

P. 330. l. 24. After Ter: Heau: Ac: 1. Sc: 1. Add: It is
 also joyn'd with the Future, or Preterperfect Tense in
 conditional Sentences. With the Future, as *Si vero*
scrutari vetera, & ex his ea, qua veteres scriptores Graci
proderunt, eruere coner: illi ipsi majorum gentium
Dii qui habentur, hinc a nobis profecti in calum reperientur.
Cic: T. Q. 1. p. 306.

Sanguine letifero totus miscbitur orbis.

Ni teneant rigida condita bella sera. Ov: Fast: 1.

P. 11.

Si quoties peccant homines, sua fulmina mittat
Jupiter, exiguuo tempore inermis erit. Id: Trist: 2, 1.

With the Preterfect, & in mea cura resistat,
jam flamma tulerint, inimicus & hauserit ensis.

Edepol na illic pulchram pradium agat, si quis illam in-
venit

Aulam onustam auri. Plaut: Aul: 3, 8.

It is connected also with a past Tense as present with
 it, as

Occipi ego observare eos quam rem gerant: Plaut: Bac:
2, 3.

Qua (i.e. signa) mihi dedit, se ut parentes cognoscami si-
cius: Plaut: Cist: Ac: 3.

P. 334. l. 12. After Sc: 4, Add: The Preterimperfect Indica-
 tive, and this Tense may also be joyn'd together in a con-
 ditional Sentence, as

Si volebas participare, auferres dimidium domum: Pl: Truc:
4, 2.

Ovid in a double conditional has this Tense in the latter
 part, and the Preterpluperfect in the other, as

Dixit, & in litem studio certaminis issent,

Atque ira pietas dissimulata foret. Fast: 6, p. 96.

P. 347.

P. 347, l. 31. After l. 5, c. 9, Add: And thus Cicero plainly distinguishes, *Id pop: Romano gratum esse, &c. foris*, Phil: 15, p. 662.

P. 356, l. 7, After Tac: Hist: 4, 671, Add:

Emulatu, neq; exercitibus securitatem, nisi extincto emulatu redituram, Tac: Hist: 3, p. 597.

l. 5. from the Bottom After *Captu* Add:

Castigatu, is in Plin: N, H, 37, C, 5. but the Place is dubious.

Circumactu. Breui circumactu corporis dieu: noctemq; pariter ostendens, Plin: N, H, 5, 22, But he has *circumactum Accus*:

P. 357, l. 25, After Translated Sense Add:

Congestu. Congestu copiarum colonia radiabantur, Tac: Hist: 2, 549,

P. 358, l. 5, From the Bottom: Add:

Extinctu. Odor a lucernarum extinctu, Plin: N, H, 7, 7.

P. 359, l. 4, After N, H, L, 23, C, 7, Add:

Germinatu. Germinatu primo sterilefcere: Plin: N. H. 15, 8, l. ult Add:

Inpersu. I have *Farina inpersu* in my Collections out of Pliny 25, 8. but there is a mistake in the figures, and I cannot recover it,

P. 360, After *Instruatu*, &c. Add:

Intercessu. Saucium intercessu suo servavit: Val: M: 5, 4.

P. 360, l. 9, After *Interpositu* and its example Add:

Intervenit. I do not find but in the Ablative; but in that several times, particularly in Pliny, *extraneis interventu*, N. H. 23, 4.

P. 360, l. 15, After *Inritatu* and its example Add:

Judicatu. De Cocceio & Libone qua scribitur approbo; maxime de judicatu meo, Cic: Ar. L: 12, Ep: 12.

After *Lingatu* and its example Add:

Litu. Usus ejus ad collyria, &c. litu ad muliebrum cicatricum facitatos tollendas: Plin: N, H, 33, 6.

After *Mactu* and its example Add:

Mistu. Primordiū seminis mistu: Colum: 6, 37.

After *Mulctu* and its example Add:

Nutritu. Multi senectam longam multi tantum nutritu coherere, Plin: N, H, 22, 24.

P. 361, After *Oratu*, &c. Add:

Palpitu. Ne palpitu ejiciatur: Plin: N, H, 9, 30.

P. 362, After *Pressu* and its examples Add:

Projeitu. Projeitu frondu. Plin: 17, 12.

P. 363, After *Provisu* and its examples Add:

Punctu. Mustela etiam oculis punctu eruitur Plin: 29, 8.

P. 264. After *Scriptu* and its example Add :

Scandiu. Quorum maxime in seductu olivae sunt. Sen : Tranq :
C. 3.

After *Spumatu* and its example Add :

Strangulatu. Vidua strangulatu. Plin : N. H. 32, 10.

P. 305. After *Ammadversion* 125, Add : *Conditui*, *Divisui*,
Esui, *Nuptui*, *Relictui*, as farther proofs of this mat-
ter.

Conditui. Uvae, itemq; olivae continui legere licet. Colum
2, 22.

Divisui. Pettipalis publica partim negligentia dilabebantur :
partim praeda & divisui principum quibusdam & magi-
stratibus erant : Liv : Dec : 4. L. 3. p. 838.

Esui. Oleas esui optime condi scribiti Caro. Var : R. R. 1, 60.

Nuptui. Minorem deinde filiam nuptui collocasse. Colum :
4, 3.

P. 365, 1. 20. After 176. Add : so Cic : also pro Cluent : 40.
Plant : Most : Ac : 2. Sc : 2. twice more than what is
quoted above.

Relictui. Ita labor quoque virilis relictui sit. Agell : 3, 1.

P. 369, 1. 27. After *has deservisset* Add : and Terence *deservisse*
Ad : 1, 2.

P. 369. After 1, ult. Add :

Sorbeo here is said to make *Sorbui* and *Sorpsi* without distin-
ction, whereas this latter is never found, but in the
compound, and that in Lucan only, and in him but
once,

Jam cumuli, collesque latent, jam flumina cuncta

Condidit una palus, vastaque voragine misit :

Absorpsit penitus rupes, & tecta serarum. Luc : L. 4.

But *Diomedes* condemns it, *Probus* prefers *Sorbui* ; nay,
he makes *Sorpsi* a Barbarism ; *Caper* disallows of *Lucan*,
and *Valius Longus* censures it severely, *Mibi vero* placet,
ut in *Latino sermone antiquitatis religio servetur*, ut po-
tius *Sorbui* secundum auctoritatem eruditissimorum, & e-
loquentium virorum, dicamus, quam *Sorpsi*, cum recens hac
declinatio sordidi sermonis vitio ceperit. Accordingly the
best Authors have always *Sorbui*. *Broutarorumq; praeda*
*exsorbu*t. Cic : Har : Resp : p. 531. *Arrogantiam pertulit*,
*difficultatem exsorbu*t : Id : pro Muran : p. 153. *Gustares*
civilem sanguinem, vel potius *exsorbu*eris : Id : Phil : 2,
p. 429. *Sed hunc absorbu*t astus quidam non insolita a-
dolescentibus goria : Id. Brut : five de Clar : Or : p.
169. *Hiatus vero alias remanet ostendens qua sorbu*t.
Plin : N. H. 2, 80. So *Absorbuisse* Id : 6, 1. *Absorbuit*,
Id : 9, 25.

P, 370, 1, 2. From the bottom after inventions of this Author Add: Here I must confess my self mistaken; for I find since in *Val: Max: L. 2. c. 1. Majores natu ad tibiis egregia superiorum opera carmine comprehensa pangebant*, quo ad ea imitanda juventutem alacriorem redderent. From which, compar'd with that of Cicero, T: Q: L. 414. it is undoubted that *Pangebant* here must be rendred *Sung*. Thus *Cic*: therefore, *Gravissimus auctor in originibus dixit Ca'o, morem apud majores, imo epularem fuisse ut deinceps, qui accubarent, caverent ad tibiis clarorum virorum laudes, atq; virtutes*. To the same purpose *Quint: Inf: L. 1. c. 10.*

P. 371. 1. 8. From the bottom after many read *vasit* Add: *Vello* does indeed make *Velli* and *Vulsi*, but this latter only in *Ovid* once, and *Lucan* 4 times. Once in *Quintilian* *Campos vulsumus*. Decl: 12. *Plautus*, *Cicero*, *Virgil*, *Pliny* all use *Velli*. *V. Pl: Pæn: 4. 2. Cic: in Verr: or 9. p. 333. pro Dom: 512, 522. Har: Resp: 528. pro Sext: 1542. T. Q. L. 2. p. 366. Plin: N. H. 842. and 30, 10. Virgil Cynthius aurem Velli. Et admonuit.*

Nec patriis Anchisa cineres, mansue revelli.

P. 373. 1, 9. Most: Ac: 3. Sc: 2. Add: *Cubo* compound has *cubavi*: *Plin: N. H. 11. 16. Nisi incubacere*; so *Incubatio Incubatus*. Id: 10, 54. And *Incubitus* Id: Ibid:

P. 374. 1, 13. From the Bottom After in the other Sense Add: *Tacitus* though has *Aboluerat*. *Dein praecipua concordia fides Titus prava cer: anima communis utilitate aboluerat*. Hist: 2. p. 502. And *Pliny* has also *exoluerint*, *Carchedoni in totum exoluerunt*. N. H. 37. 5.

P, 374. 1, 9. From the Bottom After as I can find Add: *Posco* laid to keep the doubling of the Preterperfect in the Compounds, does not always do so, witness *Fata Quorum deposcerunt*. *Val: M. 1. 7.*

P. 375. 1, 4. From the bottom After *Colum: 1. 2. c. 1.* Add: *Lavo* does not always change *l* into *n* in its compounds. *Hic elavi bonis Plaut: As: 1. 2.* Nay, I suppose *Lavo* to have been a simple Verb in this Sense from *Luere peccatum*, and the like, Punishment in some sense washing away the Sin. 'Tis certain *Cludo* for *Claudo* is found frequently, especially in *Seneca*.

Fatiscor is not among this Authors Verbs that change in Composition, yet *Terence* has *neque defetiscar usque adeo experirier*. *Phor: 4. 1.*

Lego remains entire after Composition with *Sallust* in *Intellego*, *Neglego*. *Sapo celebrata: cui nominis intellego rimentem:*

mentem: Frag: p. 166. and sua negligere: Con: Cat: P. 40.

P. 376, l. 19. After in celum scopuli Add: My brother Symes has a grievous Aversion for this Erymology, and lays about him so terribly, that I must e'en be forc'd to take up the Cudgels with him once more. It puts him so upon his mettle, that he can't stay to take it in its place; but singles it out in his Preface, to give the Reader a Sample beforehand of my Positiveness and Inconsideration, two qualities so contrary to those of a good Grammarian. Well, here's the Charge, where's the Proof now? I say, where's the Affinity between *Maneo* to tarry, and *emineo* to excell? My brother in effect says, there's as much as between *emineo* to excel, and *mineo* to point some certain way. Now *mineo* to point some certain way, compounded with *e*, will naturally signify standing, pointing out of, or above something else. And this will naturally be translated to any sort of Excellence. Here's a Reason for my Etymology. Now for that of my Brother. *Maneo* signifies to tarry or remain, denotes the Duration, not the Position of a thing. Compound *maneo* with *e*, what will it signify? Why to tarry, or stay out of a Place; and so accordingly Statius uses it.

Quis te Bachaos Unae relinquere cultus,

Quis lucor, vetitus quibus emanasse sacerdos,

Suasis, Theb: 7. v. 650. p. 266.

Mineo and its Compounds may be said of a thing the very moment it appears, *maneo* infers a Duration. *Maneo* is known to be an irregular of the 2d, Conjugation, having *mansi* in the Preterperfect, *mineo* is not known to be irregular, and may therefore well be supposed to have had the common Preterperfect *minui*, as the Compounds have. From *mineo* the Compounds come without any Change, from *maneo* we must precariously suppose a change of *a* into *i*, and all when we have an entire simple Verb of exact affinity in its Signification. But my Brother says, it is in no other Author, and but in this one place in this. However, he's in a Peck of Troubles to get rid of it. One while he is apt to believe it to be no Latin Word, though the same Author in another place has

Prous tenta minichas

Another he supposes it to stand for eminent, as *Testor* for Obtestor, *Ruam* for Eruam (and why not *Testor* and *Ruam* for themselves) only as chang'd by Composition (and that with-

without any parallel.) *Qua*

Non sane esse hominis, non sanus juret Orestes.

I have already insisted upon its *Conjugate Verb Minor* in that of *Virgil*, *Geminis; minantur;*

In celum scopulis. There are two other places in the same Author, in both which *Minor* must be taken in the same Sence,

Ille subit, mediaq; minans illakitur urbi. Minus, i. e. capite huc, Et illuc nutans, quod minantium habitus est, answerable to that

Ac veluti summis antiquam in montibus ornum,

Cum serro accisom, crebrisque bipennibus instant

Eruere agricola certatim: illa usque minatur,

Et tremefacta comam concusso vertice nutat. *Æn. 2.* which is too plain to need a Paraphrase. So mine its *Conjugate Substantive* signifying *Eminentias*, or *Pinnas murorum*, as *Servius* informs us upon that of *Virgil*, *Pendent opera interrupta minaq; Murorum impentes* *Æn. 4.* this, I say, along with the rest gives all the Countenance imaginable to the belief, that the Latins had such a Verb as *Mineo* signifying to point, or stand out beyond something, and the compounds in dispute come from it, not from *mineo*.

Pacificor is also subject to this change in Composition.

Cum tot (ie pericula) impendeant, cur non honestissimo deprecisci velim. *Cic: At: 9, 7.*

Sacro does not always change its Vowel, witness

Trivis quam desacraverat ipsa, Stat: L, 9. v. 306.

P, 377, l, 13. From the bottom After follows Add:

Allo said here to make *Altum*, and *Alitum* has no Supine at all, and for the Participle of the Preter Tense, *Altus* is only found in *Sallust* once.

P. 378, l, 16. After *Supplicium hausurum scopulis* Add: to *Stat: Achil: 3.*

P, 378, l, 14. After no mark under it Add: The places I now find are *Plin: L. 10. Ep: 109. sint licet sapienter. inculta.* *Claud: de Mal: Theod: Con: Pan: Jam satis indultum studiis:* And *Pall: de Infit: Habes aliud indulta fidei testimonium.* But for *Indulsum* or *Indulsus*, I know nothing of it.

P. 379, l, 33. After *nectis* Add: but as for *Necatus*, there are as most as many other examples of it.

Oleo though in the Compound *Aboleo*, it has most commonly *Abolevi* in the Preterperfect, has yet constantly *Abolitus* in the Participle. *Quarundam ex iis etiam nominibus abolitis.* *Plin: N, M. 14, 4, Abolitis, vel conversis prioribus*

bus. Tac: An: 3. p. 128.

Exoleo, though it has also *Exolui*, as has been shewn, has constantly *Exoletus*. *Clodius semper secum scorta, semper exoletus, semper lupas ducebat.* Cic: pro Mil.

P. 379. l. 44. After Ac: 2. Sc: 4. Add: *Plautus* though has the Participle *Pansum* Ch: *Quā formā esse aiebant ergo? Eu. Ego dicam tibi.*

Canum, varum, ventriosum, fucculentum, breviculunt; Subnigris oculis, oblongis malis, pansum aliquantulum. Merc: 3, 4.

'Tis true, he has *Passo* too Stich: 2, 3. But 'tis plain *Agellius* was overseen, when he said, *Ab eo quod est pandō, passum veteres dixerant, non pansum, Et cum praefositione expansum, non expansum.* L. 15, c. 15.

P. 380. l. 6. After l. 1. Tit: 20. Add: *Mares parituras promittunt:* Plin: N, H. 28, 19.

P. 380. l. 8. After Sc: 2. Add: The Preter Participle is also *Aperitus*, as well as *Apertus*. *Fonibus aperitis.* Plin: 15, 19.

P. 382. l. 9. After without any distinction Add: But *Quintilian* has *Detorso rudis seculi squalore.* Iust: L. 2. c. 5. though the Sense seems to me rather to require *detereso*. But then *Plin: jun: has Retorsasque cervices agnoscebamus.* Pan: Trajan.

P. 382. l. 14. After another Place Add: But I since find it in *Lucret*, l. 5. p. 139. *Non cernis simulacraque sessa fastisci.*

P. 385. l. 19. After *nubere*, l. 3. c. 6. Add: And so *Nonius* in *Nubo* says, the Ancients us'd it.

P. 385. After *Animadversion* 131. Add: *Sido* said here to make *Sedi*, makes *Sidi* also *Patiemur, pitem considero, Et quum siderit, aquam eliquabimus.* Colum: 12, 24.

P. 385. After *Divertor*, &c. Add:

Doleo should have been in this List, as well as *Placeo*, as appears by that of *Agellius*, *Id subito perdolatum est cui-dam T. Manlio*, 9, 13.

P. 386. l. 16. After the Compound *Remideo* Add: Beside these, there are several Verbs in *esco, asco, isco*, with some others, which have no Preterperfect, which I shall now put down Alphabetically, adding the Preterperfect to such, as may be suppos'd to want it.

Acesco. *Coactis* Cell: 4, 3. *exacuit* Colum: 12. 17. *Eresco, isco, Albesco.* *Albet* Plin: N. H. 12. 19. *Exalbitur.* *Agel:* 12. 1. *Arboresco.* *Baubantur.* *Calveo.* *Calvesco.* *Canesco.* *Cdnet.* *Canuerit.* Ov: Fast: 3, p. 59. *Conisco.* *Cormisco.*

Cornesco, Crassesco, Decalesco, Densco, Diluio, Ditesco,
 Dulcesco, Duresco, Obdurusset, Cic : in Ver. Induruit,
 Fateo, Fermentesco, Famesco, Flavesco, Frutesco, Gem-
 masco, esco. Grandesco, Ingrauuit Colum. 11. Gra-
 resco, Ingravesco, Hebesco, Hebesco, Herbasco, Humesco,
 Humet Ov. Ignesco, Incilo, Infelicens has no other Mood,
 Tense, Number or Person. Inolesco, Interasco, Jure-
 nesco, Latresco, Lapidesco, Lasesco, Elasesco, Lentesco,
 Livesco, Maresco, Marcesco Elmaruit, Plin : N. H. 15, 29.
 Masculesco, Miesco, Mollesco, Mucesco, Pinguesco Plumescio,
 Pubesco, Obduresco. Raresto, Ruffesco, Rutilesco, Scabe,
 Seresco, Siccesco, Solidesco, Sordesco, Sterilesto, Stirresco,
 Silvesco, Teneresco, esco, Turgesco, Adesperatessco, Veni-
 stesco, Vireo, esco Viresco.

P. 388. After Accersum Add : bba mtrm 1971A

Accubitus. Jube ire accubitus. Plaut : Men : 1, 4.

After Auctum Add :

Auctum. Auctum licentiam properatis Sall : Hist. 3, p. 156.

After Cautum Add :

Clarigatum. Clarigatum mass. Plin : N. H. 21, 4.

After Comprorum Add :

Concoctu. Concoctu difficile. Plin : N. H. 23, 8.

After Cubitum Add :

Cubitu. Primus cubitu surgat. Cat. R. R. c. 3.

Cultu. Idem solum difficile cultu. Plin : N. H. 17, 4.

After Decretum Add :

Diductum. Es sine tua opera illam in cubiculum ire adductum
 domum. Ter : Ad : 4, 5.

Decussu. Aliqui tunc decidere eum, rursusque recrescere, fa-
 cilem decussu. Plin : N. H. 11, 37.

P. 389. After Depromptum Add :

Depromptu. Facile depromptu. Agel : 20, 10.

Effatu. Digna Effatu. Plin : N. H. 3, 21.

Esu. Herbas formidolusas dictu, non esu modo. Plaut : Pl : 3, 2.

Eversum. Tribunitiam potestatem eversum. Sal : Hist : 1.

P. 137.

Exemptum. Peccatum suum alienis peccatis exemptum ikat : A-
 gel : 10, 19.

After Furdum Add :

Gestatu. Gestatu facilius. Plin : N. H. 13, 23.

After Habitatum Add :

Habitum. Honorem ire habitum. Plaut : Cil : 1, 1.

Habitu. Modus omnibus in rebus, fortis, optimum est habitu.

Plaut : Poen : 1, 2.

After Imitatu Add :

Impetratum. Quos Athenienses legaverunt impetratum ut, A-
 gel : 7, 14.

Instructum. Noctes meas instructum quarunt. Agel

14, 6.
After Irrisum Add:

Iteratum. Ridicula iteratu. Plaut: Cas: 5, 2.

Judicatum. Judicatum me uxor adducit domum. Plaut:
Al: 5. Sc: ult.

After Lesum Add:

Latrocinatum. Ibi Latrocinatum. Plaut: Trin: 2, 4.

Laudatum. Laudatum quengquam etiam vos Venire audetis.
Cic: in Ver: Or: 9. p. 333.

After Mercatum Add:

Meridiatum. Jube ad te veniam meridiatum Catull: 39.

P. 390. After Miratu Add:

Mutatu. Facilis mutatu. Tac: An: 13: p. 535.

After Nocitum Add:

Notatu. Notatu facillimum. Plin: N. H. 18, 25.

Nunciatum: Itaque ad vos venio nunciatum: Ter: Ph:

6, 7.
After Occisum Add:

Occupatum. Amicum transibo meum
Mi hanc noctem occupatum. Plaut: Stich: 3, 1.

After Oratum Add:

Ornatum. Ornatum ire Agel: 14, 6.

After Pastum Add:

Perceptu. Perceptus difficilia. Agel: 20, 10.

After Perditum Add:

Peregrinatum. Trecenta hominum millia velut peregrina-
sum miserunt. Just: L. 24. p. 225.

After Proreptum Add:

Præstmatum. Pisces præstmatum ire. Plaut: Cap: 4, 1.

After Prorogatum Add:

Purgatum. Peccatum suum purgatum ibat. Agel: 10, 19.

After Quesum Add:

Raptum. Sil: L. 9. p. 144.

After Rescirum Add:

Responsu. Quam levia genere ipso! quam falsa re!
quam brevia responsu! Cic: pro Cluent: 317.

Risum. Curre, atque risum veni. Cic: Fam: 8, 14.

After Sciscitatum Add:

Servatum. Servatum ire sociis nunciatum. Agel: 17, 3.

After Tradatu Add:

Translatu.

Translatu. Facile translatu. Liv : D. 1. L. 5.

P. 193.

After *Vapulatum* Add :

Vastatum. Vastatum fines icerat Assyrios Catul : de Com :

Ver :

After *Visum* Add :

Venum. Venum afforter. Plaut : Merc : 2, 3.

After *Violatum* Add :

Vitatu. Vitatu melius. Hor : L. 1. Sat : 4.

These are what Supines I can discover among these Authors, and I believe the Reader will find but very few more.

P. 396. After *Astrictior* Add :

Affuetior. Hispanorum cohors affuetior montibus. Liv. D. 3. L. 2. p. 443.

Execratissimus. Et sunt condita auguria quia loquenti cogitante id acciderit, inter execratissima At : execratissimas. Plin : N. H. 28. 2.

P. 397. After *Collector* Add :

Colorator. Si plenior aliquis, & speciosior, & colorator factus est. Cels : 2, 2.

Comperitus. Sed qui hoc comperitus memoria prodiderunt. Agel : 1, 11.

P. 397, After *Conductior*, &c. Add :

Conferior. Conferiores steterant : Liv : D. 1, L. 9. P. 333.

P. 398, After *Contentius*, &c. Add :

Contentior. Syria rex nullo contentioris exempli : Val : M, 9, 1.

P. 398. After *Cumulator* Add :

Cumularissime. Quibus me cumulatissime satis fecisse certo scio. Cic : Fam : 10. 29.

P. 398, After *Cunctanior* Add :

Cuneator : Ad inum cuneator, Liv : D. 1, L. 9. P. 343.

After *Decentior* Add :

Decentissime. Decentissime descripta à majoribus iura. Cic : pro Cæc : 386.

P. 399. After *Depressior* Add :

Desertior. Ut nullius reditus unquam fuit desertior. Cic : in Pis : 276.

Desideratissimus. Desideratissimisque promissis addidisse vine. Pl : N. H. 30. 1.

After *Dilutius* Add :

Dilutissima. Potio dilutissima. Cels : 1, 3.

After *Distractor* Add :

Distractissimus. Tanquam distractissimus ille tantorum operum mole huic uni vacaret animus. Patere : Hist : 1 p. 138.

Elatius. Elatius quam aetate eius decebat. Agel : 9, 15.

P. 400. After *Emendatior* Add :

Emendatissimus. Atque ego optimum, & emendatissimum existimo. Plin : L. 8. Ep. 20.

After *Exactissimus* Add :

Exacutior. Exacutior in mucronem fastigiata. Plin : N. H. 18, 18.

Exaggeratius. Nam neque ornatus sit additis manubus, neque Exaggeratius modulatus sit. Agel : 13, 23.

Extenuatissima. Copia extenuatissima. Cic : Fam : 11, 13.

P. 401. After *Exultior* Add :

Exultantius. Exultantius scripsi. Plin : jun : 3, 18.

Exultantissimus. Alioqui sit exultantissimum : Quint : 10, 9, 4.

After *Honoratior* Add :

Honoratissimus. Hominis honoratissima conjunctio Cic : Fam : 3. Ep. 10.

Ignoscentior. Animus ignoscentior. Ter : Heaut : 4, 1.

Immansuetissimus. At tu de rapide immansuetissima venit. Ov : Lean : Her :

After *Impotentior* Qu. Add :

Impatientiores reddis : Cic : Fam : 4, 9.

P. 402. After *Impunitior* Add :

Inauspiratior. V. Auspiratior.

Inauspicatissimus. Inauspicatissima fetus tempore. Plin : 10, 12.

After *Indecentissimus.* Add :

Indignantissimus. Derritus indignantissimus. Colum : 8, 17.

Indigentior. Cum fuerit indigentior. Plin : N. H. 13, 12.

After *Inflator* Add :

Immacentior. Quis beneficia fecit immacentiora. Plin : N. H. 28, 1.

Innocentissimus. Sua cuique vino saliva innocentissima. Plin : N. H. 23, 1.

After *Inoffensor* Add :

Inordinatissimus. Palpebrarum pilos inordinatissimos regit. Plin : 22, 22.

After *Intemperantior* Add :

Intemperatissimus. Hominis intemperatissimus : Cic : Fam : 10, 1.

Imp

- Invidiosissimus, Facis invidiosissimis.* Plaut : Mil. 1. 1.
- P. 403. After *Futisconsulissimus*, Add :
Latentius. Latentius potuit dari. Cic : pro Clu : p. 418, 419.
- Laxatior. Membrana laxatiore.* Plin : N. H. 19. 1.
 After *Luxentius* Add :
Magnificentissimus. Magnificentissime consecerunt. Cic : Att : 14. 4.
 After *Mansuetissimus* Add :
Medicatus. Lac bubulum Medicatus. Plin : N. H. 28. 9.
 After *Modulatissimus* Add :
Monstratior is cited out of Pliny by Goldman, if it be there, I have overlook'd it.
 After *Noceatissimus* Add :
Mominatissimus. Vicina est Baetris in qua Baellium nominatissimum. Plin : N. H. 12. 9.
 After *Perspectissimus* Qu : Add :
Tua Erga me perspectissima benevolentia. Cic : Att : 11. 1.
 After *Projectissimus* Add :
Prominentior. Cauda prominentiore. Plin : N. H. 10. 3.
 After *Reconciliissimus* Add :
Refertus. Num refertus erit ararium. Cic : in Ver : Or : 8. P. 327.
- P. 406. After *Solutissimus* Add :
Sonantior. Gravior & sonantior erat. Plin : jun : 6. 16.
Sparrior. Cujus sparsior racemus. Plin : N. H. 16. 34.
- It may be said here, and possibly it will, that this Diligence is over-scrupulous, and the matter too Minute for the Pains. If it be so, in the first Place 'tis my Labour only that is lost, the Readers in certainly sav'd, who now has good Authority to recur to for the use of these Words. Secondly, The Labour is no more lost here, than in the exactness of any other Part of Grammar. The Comparison of these Voices is no more at our Pleasure in a fix'd Language, as this is, than the several Inflections of the several Parts of Speech, which being fix'd and determin'd, we are to follow them, not to invent, and innovate, as the fancy takes us. Thus to break through a stated Language, is nothing but to Face out Sloth and Ignorance, with Vulgar Pleas, and that of Horace will be their Fate that do so.
- Invidiam placare parat virtute relicta,
 Contemnere miser*

If it be said, that every one of this kind of Words may be compar'd when it signifies a Quality, or Habit in the Substantive, and that's Rule enough ; I desire to be heard before that Bill pass'es, and when from *Accisus, Amatus, Debilitatus, Confectus, Delinitus, Destitutus, Expositus, Fatigatus, Lucubratus, Meditatus, Perferens, Obiectus*, and many others ; which are often found to signify Qualities, or Habits ; when from these, I say, shall be produc'd *Accisior, Amator, &c.* I shall then give my Consent, but not till then.

APPENDIX.

NOrwithstanding all the Care I could take, I find some Words have escap'd my Observation, till the Book was Printed off. And possibly there may be some still ; either wholly unobserv'd, or amongst such an infinite Number of mark'd Passages in the Books, overlook'd. I have done what I can to recover them, which I beg the Reader to refer to their proper Places.

P. 32. l. 19. After *Sit dubium* Add :

Casses in *Pliny* is Feminine, if the Text be right, *Ha casses* (*casses* vel I suppose it should be) *ferri aciem vincunt*, N. H. 19. But then in the Margin is *Hi casses*.

Caules is Feminine in *Cato*, *Vinear novellas alligatis crebro, ne caules satæ perfingantur*. R. R. c. 33.

P. 50. l. 5. After the Neuter Add :

Sinapis should have been here rather than some others, for *Celsus* has it Masculine, *Sinapis contriti*. L. 5. c. 18.

P. 51. l. 16. After *Philocomum* Add :

Juvenis is allow'd by *Vossius* to signify both Sexes, but then he will not allow it the Feminine Gender, when it is put for a Woman. His Reason is, there is no Example of it. I believe as much. But what then ? Is nothing to be done without Example ? Does *Analogy* signify nothing ? If I must say, *This young Woman*, I must say, *Hic*, or *Hac Juvenis*. And *Juvenis* being but an Adjective, sure I cannot say, *Hic Femina Juvenis*.

P. 90. l. 5. From the Bottom, After l. 3, c. 1. Ti : Add : *Basis* though it have *Basin*, or *Basim* only in the Acculative, has *Basi*, or *Base*, in the Ablative. *In Base quod calarum est*. *Plin* : N. H. 36. 5.

ad. v. 2. Tab. 2.
in 17. Egidium
lehra Juvenis
perat.

P. 108. l. 6. After l. 23. c. 10. Add: *Tyrannida* is also found in Cicero. *Ad Att*: L. 4. Ep: 14.

P. 139. l. 21. After *Apic*: *Cepure*. c. 2. Add: So also *Pallad*: *Apr*: T. 2.

P. 141, After *Malva* and its examples Add:

Melanthium. *Nascuntur gracili Melanthia grata cumino*. *Colum*: 10.

After *Sesama* and its examples Add:

Sisymbria. *Cumq; sua domina cate grata Sisymbria myrta*.

Ov: *Fast*: 4 P, 77.

P. 145, After *Cruores* and its several examples Add:

Defrutat. *Aut igni Pinguia multo*

Defrutat. *Vii*: *Geo*: 4.

This the Grammar allows indeed, but I put it down, because 'tis so rare, (being only here and in *Pliny* 14. 21. as I remember at present) that it might be dispured. But then this same Grammar says nothing of *Vina* which is Ordinary, and to which this seems to be but an Adjective.

P. 147, After *Cera* and its examples Add:

Galbanum has the Plural *Noxia Galbana* *Colum*: 10.

P. 166. After *Cognitionibus* Add:

Comitatibus. *semper comitatibus latatus*. *Quint*: *Deo*: 5.

P. 180. l. 18. After and often elsewhere, Add: Neither is this Name of this Disease ever singular. I find nothing else of it, but *Tormina*, *Torminum*, *Torminibus*.

P. 371. After *Rapio* and its examples Add:

Sero (to Plant) is found to make *Serui*:

Non minore curam item conserat, et cum Seruerit: *Sec. Colum.*

3. 4. Let the Reader see another Book, here's *Conseuerit* just before.

P. 388. After *Dejectum*: Add.

Deliberatum; *delphos*, *deliberatum missi* *Nep*: *Milt*:

THE E. N. D.

ERRATA.

P², l, 2, from the bottom for *propis* read *propiis*. P, 4, l, 25, for *orate*, read *or are*. P. 13, l, 17, for *too much*, read *too much*, P, 18, l, 25, for *Women*, read *Woman*. P, 18, l, 8, From the Bottom, for *ronoun*, read *pronoun*. P, 18, l, 2, from the bottom, for *I'll*, read *I call*, P, 22, l, 10, for *extra*, read *extra*. P, 25, l, 11, for *this rare*, read *this rate*, P, 26, l, 16, for *alâ*, read *aliâ*. P, 27, l, 21, for *addeunt*, read *addebant*. P, 28, l, 1, From the Bottom, for *somniavi*, read *somniari*. P, 29, l, 2, for *ipsa*, read *ipfa*. P, 29, l, 11, for *delgandus*, read *delegandus*. P, 40, l, 8, From the Bottom, for *vetstauibus*, read *vetustatibus*. P, 44, l, 19, for *Navins*, read *Navius*. P, 44, l, 21, for *inquint*, read *inquunt*. P, 48, l, 17, for *antestor*, read *antestor*. P, 48, l, 22, for *quadrapiuna*, read *quadrapiuna*. P, 49, l, 7, From the bottom for *preterfect*, read *preterperfect*. P, 50, l, 30, for *pradum*, read *pradam*. P, 55, l, 17, for *inform*, read *informis*.